



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





ECCLESIA.

SECOND SERIES.

Digitized by Google

ECCLESIA:
A SECOND SERIES OF ESSAYS

ON .

Theological and Ecclesiastical Questions.

BY VARIOUS WRITERS.

EDITED BY

HENRY ROBERT REYNOLDS, D.D.



LONDON:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

—
MDCCCLXXI.

110. m. 126.



Printed by Watson and Hazell, London and Aylesbury.

P R E F A C E.

THE following Essays deal with theological and ecclesiastical questions which were left comparatively untouched in the earlier series of ECCLESIA.

Differences of ecclesiastical position are sometimes the offspring of diversity of taste, temper, and practical experience and have occasionally taken their origin in political, social, and personal animosities; but far more frequently they have arisen out of deep conscientious convictions and fundamental divergencies in the region of pure thought and of religious faith. Some religious differences and theological speculations have no natural tendency whatever to promote ecclesiastical dissension; other diversities of thought must end in corresponding organizations.

The following Essays will be of service if they indicate some of the ideas touching the Divine life in man, the incarnation of God, and the worship, the revelation, and the Church of the living God, to which Congregationalism in part owes its origin. The Essays will, moreover, evince no less clearly

the extent to which it is reasonable for Congregationalists to claim the designations of Christian and Catholic. Other questions of deep practical interest, bearing upon the culture and education of Nonconformists, have been discussed by gentlemen who have earned peculiar right to deal with them. The Authors of these pages have written without mutual concert, and are solely and exclusively responsible for the opinions they have individually expressed.

C O N T E N T S.

	PAGE
I. BAPTISMAL REGENERATION. BY ENOCH MELLOR, D.D.	1
II. THE INCARNATION. BY W. L. ALEXANDER, D.D.	65
III. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. BY THE EDITOR	118
IV. ART AND RELIGION. BY JOSIAH GILBERT	178
V. RULE OF FAITH ; OR, CREEDS AND CREED. BY HENRY BACHELOR	248
VI. OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES. BY A. S. WILKINS, M.A.	299
VII. THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM. BY R. W. DALE, M.A.	355

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

"As for these Sacramentarian quarrels," observed Bishop Hall, "how bitter have they been! how frequent! how long! in six successions of learned conflicts. In these cases the very victory is miserable; such (as Pyrrhus said of his) as is enough to undo the conqueror." These words of the learned and godly prelate, who was one of the most formidable champions of his Church, are now two centuries old; but the conflicts over which he mourned, so far from having ceased, have grown from six to a number which we may well shrink from defining. The general literature which these controversies have created within the last fifty years alone would form a library of considerable dimensions, consisting of treatises which traverse the whole distance from the four-leaved tract to the learned and ponderous volume; while the special literature of a forensic nature which has recorded the litigations promoted now by one party and then by another, before the Arches Court and the Privy Council, demonstrates that the "Sacramentarian quarrels" have been more than logical exercises, and have sought the forcible extrusion of the heretical sentiments and their propagators from the pale of the Anglican Church. Indeed, it may be said with truth that at no period since the death of Elizabeth have the sacerdotal conceptions of the Sacraments been more in the ascendant than they are now, or propagated with so much zeal and determination, for the purpose of winning for them supreme and exclusive authority in these realms. To secure this end, nothing will be wanting which wealth, talent, culture, and self-denial can furnish. How far such an end is

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

desirable, or consistent either with the teaching of Scripture or the eternal well-being of man, we shall see in the course of this essay. But this we may say, that no Eirenicon which counsels a truce, or, still more, a peace between those sections of the Church which maintain opposing judgments on the efficacy of the Sacraments, will be successful. Such a strife cannot, from its very nature, be composed by exhortations to a broad reciprocal charity. Controversies which spring from words alone die out as soon as clear definitions have been reached and accepted; and controversies which concern matters that are secondary may be terminated by consent under the influence of a wisdom which can distinguish between a fundamental unity and a superficial diversity. Forms of worship, and vestments, where they are not symbolic, and, as such, provocative as party banners, may surely be left to the tastes and preferences of individual men. But the difference as to the nature of the sacraments and their power is one which reaches down to the very foundation of the whole fabric of revealed truth; and we should think little of the moral earnestness or spiritual faith of any man who, for the sake of an outward and unreal peace, could consent on these momentous questions to suppress his own convictions, and to be silent respecting what he regards as the fatal teaching of his ministerial brethren.

It is true that the legal justification which the Gorham decision gave to the most contradictory faiths should terminate any internecine struggle which simply aims at the extrusion of one party or another from the pale of the Church of England. All are safely entrenched, and may hold their positions with equal honour; but the mere fact of their common churchmanship will never seal their lips on those stupendous questions on which they differ. Those who maintain that Baptism is the door, and the only door, into the kingdom of Heaven,—that it is the exclusive channel through which regenerative grace is imparted to the soul,—will not endure those impoverishing representations, as they deem them, which make the ordinance nothing but a symbol, or a hypothetical blessing; nor will the latter quietly suffer the souls of the people to be ensnared by what in their view is a monstrous and superstitious delusion.

The ultimate triumph of Christian truth is not to be achieved

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

by a prudential reticence, but by that strenuous contending for the faith which shall "speak the truth in love;" and the earnest recommendations which have of late counselled, in the true Erastian spirit, a cessation of active antagonism between the high Sacramentarians of the Church of England and their opponents, have failed to appreciate the profound spiritual issues which are involved, or have been content to subordinate those issues to the inglorious end of maintaining the outward integrity of an Establishment which should embrace and authorize, as they allege, the most diverse theological faiths. Happily, this untempered mortar neither will nor can avail to close up and conceal the chinks in the wall.

The positions which respectively affirm and deny the saving efficacy of Baptism are too wide apart ever to be conciliated at any middle point. Nothing has been more fully established than this by the whole history of the Church; and the strife, therefore,—divested we trust of all unchristian heat, craft, and bitterness,—will continue until God shall give the victory to His own pure word. What, on the nature of Baptism, is the teaching of that word when taken in its whole breadth, instead of being interpreted in the light of some isolated passage which itself must be amenable to the general scope of revelation, we hope to show in the sequel.

In making the Scriptures the sole standard of appeal, we intend absolutely to exclude the authority of the Fathers as infallible or trustworthy guides in their interpretation; and we do this, not simply because the general stress of their language is in favour of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, but because they were in no position of advantage which entitles their opinions to more weight than those of eminent critics of modern times. Many of them were wholly ignorant of the Hebrew tongue. Augustine had but a very partial knowledge of the Greek, and the passion which prevailed in most of them and even in the most sober, to find under the letter of Scripture not merely the true sense but a number of mystic significations by which the true sense became confused and obscured, corrupted the opinions of the Church for many generations, and the corruptions remain in great part down to the present day. For the eloquence of some of the Fathers, for the subtlety

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

and power with which they unravelled and exposed the heresies which from time to time arose through the influence of heathen philosophy and superstition, we entertain a due reverence; and until sacred learning fall into contempt, some of their works will continue to claim the study and admiration of the Christian Church. But we must not be beguiled into an unquestioning homage to their opinions by the consideration of their high antiquity, and their comparative proximity to the apostolic age. Their antiquity makes them unexceptionable witnesses to the opinions and customs prevalent in their own times, but stamps no value either on their philosophical or theological faiths. They were no nearer to the Scriptures than the Church of the nineteenth century, and no nearer to that Holy Spirit by whose enlightening grace alone the truth which has been outwardly revealed can be inwardly apprehended. The Book, and the Lord of the Book, are as nigh to us as they were to them, and the true principles of criticism which have been developed and tested within the last half century, together with the profound and accurate knowledge—surpassing that of any of the Fathers—which is possessed by many European scholars, have exalted the interpretation of Scripture into a science—a name wholly inapplicable to the Hermeneutical practices of the first four centuries. And even where the principles of interpretation recognized by the Fathers were better than their practice, they violated them without scruple to meet controversial emergencies, urging one meaning and then another as would best suit their case. What modern divine who cherished his own reputation would with Hippolytus make Isaac represent God, Rebecca the Holy Spirit, Esau the Jewish nation, and Jacob, Christ? or with Ambrose make the four rivers of Paradise represent the four cardinal virtues, and the fish which contained in its mouth the piece of money the first martyr, and the piece of money Christ himself?—or who would with Jerome see in the fish caught by Peter the liberation of the first Adam by the second? or with Augustine interpret Jerusalem, in the parable of the Good Samaritan, as the city of heavenly peace from which man has fallen, Jericho as the moon signifying our mortality, the robbers as the devil and his angels, the beast as the flesh in which our

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

Saviour was incarnate, the inn as the church, the morrow as the period of the resurrection, the twopence as the two precepts of charity, or the promise of the present and the future life,—to say nothing of those numberless extravagant and fantastic interpretations which fill the pages of Origen? A commentator who should now indulge in their license of interpretation would forfeit universal confidence, and we are at a loss to know upon what principle the authority of the early Fathers is pleaded on matters upon which the moderns are better qualified to judge than they were. It is, moreover, too often forgotten that the deference which since the Oxford Tract movement has been claimed for the Fathers as interpreters of Scripture is such as they neither sought nor gave to each other, for though we find Augustine speaking of his predecessors with respect, he nowhere allows himself to be fettered by their opinions, but on some questions of considerable moment stands almost and even wholly alone. We venture to doubt whether any Father prior to his own age would have endorsed his treatise on predestination, and we are sure that many of the positions he has there advanced and defended with a pitiless logic are in demonstrable contradiction to the writings of earlier Fathers. And what is true of Augustine is equally true of Ambrose, his spiritual father, who upon one of the most important points connected with the valid administration of Baptism sets at defiance the opinion and practice of the whole Church for at least three centuries, and maintains, that Baptism into the name of the Lord Jesus is as efficacious a formula as Baptism “into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Cyprian denounced the opinion as a heresy in his day, and expresses his astonishment that any man should hold the remission of sins to be attainable under such a mutilated formula.* Athanasius declared that the man who was baptized in the name of the Father only, or of the Son only, or of both, but without the Holy Spirit, derived no benefit whatever.† St. Basil devotes a whole chapter to the question, and disallows the validity of any Baptism except in the name of the Trinity.‡ Augustine asks who is ignorant

* Cypriani Opera, Epist. ad Serapion, tom. i., p. 204.

† Epist. ad Jubaian, 73, p. 206. ‡ De Spiritu Sancto, cap. 12.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

of the fact that there is no Christian Baptism if the evangelic words of which the Creed consists are wanting? * Theodoret, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, and Theophylact uphold the same views; and Pope Vigilius issues a decree which, as being *de fide*, and consequently infallible, retrospectively excommunicates all who have baptized in the name of but one person in the Trinity.† And yet Ambrose in language the most express claims the liberty of disregarding the consenting opinions of his contemporaries and his predecessors alike, and affirms that he who is "blessed in Christ, is blessed in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, because the name is one, and the power one. He cites the fact that the Æthiopian eunuch was baptized in the name of Christ, and yet obtained all the benefit of the sacrament. He declares that to be baptized into any of the names of the Trinity, provided that the Trinity itself is held, is sufficient.‡ With a fact like this before us, which exhibits in so striking a manner the independence which each father claimed for himself as an interpreter of Scripture, and the defiance with which he could treat a general *consensus* of both opinion and practice, we may well wonder at that doating and abject reverence for patristic authority of which we have seen so remarkable a revival in our days. Such homage is astounding if based on ignorance of the Fathers, but if based on a knowledge of them it is more astounding still.

In proceeding to discuss the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, we may observe that the word Regeneration, by which its Greek equivalent *παλιγγενεσία* is rendered in our authorized version, occurs only twice in the New Testament, and its meanings in these instances are palpably distinct from each other. In Matthew xix. 28, it cannot be interpreted as having any allusion to Baptism, or to a new nature realized through means of this sacrament, except by a violence of critical handling which would deprive Hermeneutics of its scientific character altogether. Our Saviour, in reply to the question of Peter as to what recompense shall be given hereafter to those

* De Baptismo, lib. 6, c. 25.

† Vigilius, Epist. 2, ad Eutherum, c. 6.

‡ Ambrosius, De Spiritu Sancto, lib. i., c. 3.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

who, like him, and his fellow-disciples, have left all to follow their Lord, said, "Ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The connection of regeneration with the words which precede is now generally abandoned as untenable and its reference to some *future* event conceded, though with considerable diversity of opinion as to what that future event may be. Some regard it as alluding to the resurrection of Christ himself; others to the general resurrection of the dead; others to the moral and spiritual renovation which is to be effected in the human race by the power of the Gospel; others to the restitution of all things; others to the day of judgment; and others to the happiness to be expected in the life to come. To adjudicate upon the claims of these conflicting interpretations, even were it possible, is not necessary for our present purpose. It is enough to observe that no intimation of the sacrament of Baptism can be discovered in the words of our Lord.

The only other instance in which the word *παλιγγενεσία* occurs in the New Testament, is in Titus iii. 5: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He hath saved us through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." What is the strength of support yielded by this passage to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, we shall consider more at large in a subsequent part of this essay, in which we shall examine the arguments of Dr. Pusey in his renowned Tract on "Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism." The extra-Scriptural import of the term is always significant of a great change, and that uniformly for the better. When Cicero had returned from exile, and became reinstated in his former dignity and fortunes, he termed it a *παλιγγενεσία*. By the same term Josephus characterizes the return of the Jews from Babylon to their native land; and Philo describes the condition of the earth after the waters of the deluge had disappeared as its *παλιγγενεσία*. The one common element which is found in all the instances in which the word occurs, whether in sacred or profane writers, is that of an improved condition, whether in matter, in circumstances, or in the soul.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

Though, however, the compound term *παλιγγενεσία* is found only in the two cited instances in the New Testament, the idea of regeneration finds other expressions in abundance. We have the birth "of water and of the spirit" (John iii. 5), "the birth from above" (John iii. 3), the birth "not from corruptible seed, but from incorruptible, even the word of God" (1 Peter i. 23), the birth "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John i. 13); we have the result of the re-creative energy and grace of the Holy Spirit in the "new man," "the new creature," the "sons of God," the "children of God," the "heirs of God," the "joint-heirs with Jesus Christ;" we have the outward development and authentication of this inward result in "newness of life." The minuter analysis of these passages, with scarcely a word of comment, will enable the reader to see how far regeneration can be truthfully said to be connected with Baptism.

There are two instances of the employment of the phrase new creature, or creation (*καινή κτίσις*).

(1). 2 Cor. v. 17: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature."

(2). Galatians vi. 15: "For in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." In neither of these passages is there any allusion to Baptism, and the latter by implication cautions us against reliance on sacramental efficacy.

There are two instances in which the expression new man (*καινός ἀνθρωπος*) occurs in relation to the Christian.

(1). Ephesians iv. 24: "And that ye put on the new man, which is created after God's image in righteousness and true holiness." And this putting on of the new man, so far from being a baptismal regeneration, is enjoined on those who have already been baptized, and have been for some time members of the body of Christ.

(2). Colossians iii. 10: "And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him."

There are ten passages in which the phrase translated "children of God" occurs, and in not one of these is there any

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

allusion to Baptism as the means by which the filial relation is established or manifested.*

There are six passages in which the phrase rendered "sons of God" occurs, and in all of them there is the same absolute silence concerning Baptism.†

There are twelve passages in which the word "born" occurs in manifest reference to spiritual regeneration, and in only one of these is water mentioned; in none of them is Baptism mentioned, while the majority of them are in connections with which the conception of Baptism is clearly incongruous.‡

There are five passages in which the word "renewed" or "renewing" occurs, and in the last of these alone, and in that doubtfully, does the idea of Baptism appear.§

These words and phrases may be justly considered as equivalents or correlatives of regeneration as a spiritual change, and yet the infrequency of their association with Baptism, either as cause or condition, is as we have now stated it. The induction we do not pronounce decisive, but it is ample, and significant.

It is now admitted on all hands that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is the doctrine of the Church of England; but the moment we come to consider the definition of the phrase, a variety of meanings emerges—meanings too which, instead of being complementary of each other, are reciprocally exclusive and contradictory. It is almost impossible to reduce them to a classification which shall be at once distinct and exhaustive, for while the extremes are sufficiently contrasted not to be confounded, the intermediate ones shade off into each other so insensibly as to become somewhat perplexing. Hence it sometimes happens that the same writer may be cited as supporting now one and now another theory of Baptismal Regeneration. The following classification we

* Matt. v. 9; Luke xx. 36; John xi. 51, 52; Romans viii. 16; Romans viii. 21; Romans ix. 8; Romans ix. 26; Galat. iii. 26; 1 John iii. 10; 1 John v. 2.

† John i. 12; Romans viii. 14; Romans viii. 19; Philip. ii. 15; 1 John iii. 1; 1 John iii. 2.

‡ John i. 13; John iii. 5; John iii. 6; John iii. 7; John iii. 8; 1 Peter ii. 2; 1 John ii. 4; 1 John iii. 9; 1 John iv. 7; 1 John v. 1; 1 John v. 4; 1 John v. 18.

§ 2 Cor. iv. 16; Ephes. iv. 23; Col. iii. 10; Rom. xii. 2; Titus iii. 5.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

submit not as absolutely but as approximately accurate; and we believe that whatever peculiarities of opinion it does not expressly provide for will be found to ally themselves virtually with one or other of these propositions.

I. Baptismal Regeneration denotes a change in the outward relations of the subject to Church privileges.

II. Baptismal Regeneration denotes both a change in the outward relations of the subject to Church privileges, and an inward change of nature.

The second form of the doctrine assumes four varieties, according as the *inward change of nature* is,—

(1) Occasional only; or, (2) Constant; and according as *the continuance of the change* is either, (3) Precarious, or, (4) Indefectible.

These four subordinate elements are variously combined, for we find, for example, that the same person who maintains that the inward change is only an occasional accompaniment of Baptism, holds it to be absolutely indestructible; and the same person who maintains that the inward grace is invariably communicated in Baptism, rightly administered, asserts that it abides only where it is cherished like a seed which may be nurtured to maturity, or may perish through neglect. The former combination is represented by Goode and Mozley, and such Calvinists in the Church as attribute any spiritual efficacy whatever to the sacrament of Baptism; and the latter is represented by Dr. Pusey. Of this latter, again, there are two special varieties which we shall dismiss with a mention. These relate to the condition of such as have lost the baptismal grace, which by some is affirmed to be recoverable, and by others irrecoverable. There are, therefore, three leading hypotheses touching the nature of Baptismal Regeneration,—the first teaching that its effects are *wholly objective*; the second teaching that they are *partly objective and partly subjective*, the subjective being *invariably* produced, though *precarious as to their continuance*; and the third teaching that they are *partly objective and partly subjective*, the *subjective being occasionally produced, and yet indefeasible*.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

I.

THE OBJECTIVE THEORY,—THAT BAPTISMAL REGENERATION DENOTES A CHANGE IN THE OUTWARD RELATIONS OF THE SUBJECT TO CHURCH PRIVILEGES.

One of the most celebrated tractates on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration is that of Waterland, which consists of two sermons that were preached first at Twickenham and then at Windsor. It is, in fact, an elaborate treatise based on the words of St. Paul to Titus, "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." It presents to us the views of one of the most learned and accomplished theologians of the Church of England, though it must be confessed that they are views which have been far from securing the universal allegiance of his brethren. "*Regeneration*" he defines as "passively considered but another word for the *new birth* of a Christian ; and that new birth, in the general, means a spiritual *change* wrought upon any person by the Holy Spirit in the use of *Baptism*, whereby he is translated from his *natural state* in *Adam* to a *spiritual state* in *Christ*."*

"The name, or the notion, probably was not altogether *new* in our Lord's time ; for the Jews had been used to admit converts from heathenism into the Jewish Church by a *baptism* of their own, and they called the admission or reception of such converts by the name of *regeneration*, or *new-birth*, as it was somewhat like the bringing them into a *new world*. Such *proselytes* were considered as *dead* to their former state of darkness, and born anew to light, liberty, and privileges among the children of Israel, and within the Church of God. The figure was easy, natural, and affecting ; and, therefore, our Lord was pleased in His conference with Nicodemus to adopt the same kind of language, applying it to the case of admitting converts both from Judaism and Paganism into Christianity ; transferring and sanctifying the rite, the figure, and the name to higher and holier, but still similar purposes" (p. 344).

His conception of the word *spiritual* we confess somewhat baffles us, for in endeavouring to establish a distinction between regeneration and renewal he says that the former is a "renewal

* Oxford Edition, 1823, vol. vi., p. 343.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

of the spiritual state" (p. 349), and the latter a renewal of the "heart and mind," and that so far as a renewal of mind is necessary to a renewal of state, so far it is a necessary ingredient of the new birth, or an internal part of it" (p. 354). His use of the word "spiritual" is neither scriptural nor in accordance with its modern meaning, and his use of the word "state" to denote not the condition of the man in himself, but his federal relation to certain external privileges, requires to be marked by any who would seek to elicit from his treatise any intelligible and consistent theory. "Regeneration," he says, "is itself a kind of *renewal*, but then it is of the *spiritual state* considered *at large*; whereas *renovation*, the other article in the text, seems to mean a more *particular* kind of *renewal*—namely, of the inward *frame* or *disposition* of the man, which is rather a *capacity* or *qualification* (in *adults*) for salutary regeneration, than the regeneration itself"* (p. 349).

From these words we are to learn that in the case of *adults*, renovation of the inward frame or disposition precedes in the order of time the actual regeneration, and sustains towards it the relation of *capacity* or *qualification*. If we comprehend we certainly do not approve either the psychology or the theology of our author. We cannot conceive that frame or disposition of a man which shall be a qualification for regeneration, which shall be, moreover, as the text affirms, the product of the Holy Spirit, and yet which shall not be an essential element in the regeneration itself. And we cannot escape the conviction that Waterland's text and exposition are at hopeless variance with each other. His text speaks of "the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" and if these two members of the sentence are to be regarded as expressing different though related ideas, and if the order in which they occur is to be deemed as denoting the relation, in point of time, between *regeneration* and *renovation*, then the conclusion is pressed upon us irresistibly that the *regeneration* precedes the *renovation*, and that the renovation is not a capacity or qualification for regeneration, but is consequent upon it. It was concerning *adults* that the apostle was writing, and adults too, we doubt not, who were baptized as such; and hence if Water-

* The italics in all our citations from Waterland are his own.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

land maintain the essential distinction between *regeneration* and *renewal*, we demur to the inversion which he makes of the language of St. Paul, and maintain that *that* renewal of the Holy Ghost which he designates as a "capacity or qualification for salutary regeneration" is wholly destitute of scriptural support. A divine renovation of the soul preparatory to regeneration is a figment to which even the great authority of Water-land can secure no enduring life. Philosophically, it resists all attempts to grasp it; and theologically, it does violence to the explicit teaching of the Divine Word. If there be any relation or dependence at all between "the washing of regeneration" and the "renewing of the Holy Ghost," if they be not (as we hold they are) constituent parts in one Divine operation, but distinct stages in it, then the washing of regeneration even in adults must, on the authority of this passage, precede "the renewing of the Holy Ghost."

In a subsequent part of his treatise his language acquires additional perplexity, which renders it more difficult than ever to seize clearly and firmly his theory of Regeneration. In considering the case of such as backslide, he says: "A third case which I promised to speak to is that of those who fall off after they have once been savingly *regenerated*. If any such persons *fall away* by desertion and disobedience, still their baptismal *consecration*, and their *covenant state* consequent, abide and stand, but without their saving effect for the time being; because without present *renovation*, the *new birth*, or *spiritual life*, as to salutary purposes, is, in a manner, sinking, drooping, ceasing. Their regenerate state, upon their revolt, is no longer such, in the *full* saving sense, wanting one of its *integral* parts; like as a ruined house ceases to be an *house* when it has nothing left but *walls*. But yet as an house, while there are *walls* left, does not need to be *rebuilt* from the ground, but repaired only, in order to become an *house* again as before; so a person once savingly *regenerated*, and afterwards losing all the *salutary* use of it, will not want to be *regenerated* again, or born anew, but to be re-formed only. Which when done, his regeneration, before decayed, and as to any saving effect for the time well-nigh ruined, but never totally lost, becomes again whole and entire" (pp. 358, 359).

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

Our anxiety in making observations upon this passage is to do no injustice to the sentiments of Dr. Waterland, and our difficulty is to ascertain with accuracy what his sentiments are. He has, unfortunately for his readers, such a propensity to insert incidental phrases of a qualifying character, that the operation of reading him is frequently like an attempt to clear a complex algebraic equation of its brackets, and we are left wondering at the close of a paragraph what is the precise nature of the truth he intends to affirm. For example, the case he is here considering is that of persons whose godliness is in a state of declension, and they are characterized as men "who have once been savingly regenerated." We are at a loss to know what he means by a saving regeneration. Is there a regeneration which does not save, and if so, what is it, and how is it produced? And in what manner do the two regenerations differ from each other so far as their effects are concerned? for it would appear that even the saving regeneration is one which may *not* save. Our Saviour nowhere intimates a twofold regeneration—a regeneration that saves, and a regeneration that does not save; and still less does He speak of a *saving* regeneration that does not save. The architectural allusion of Dr. Waterland is singularly unhappy, as it overthrows the very position for which it was adduced. The walls and the foundation which remain when all else is decayed represent the regeneration which does not require to be repeated! But how can they represent the regeneration when we were informed that the renewal of the heart, in an adult, precedes regeneration, and is a capacity or qualification for it? The very foundation of the spiritual house in an adult is, according to the reiterated declaration of Dr. Waterland, a *renewal of heart and life*. Regeneration is the superstructure; and if his picture is to illustrate his theology, and not contradict it, it is the Regeneration which is in ruins.

When Dr. Waterland proceeds to say that "*perfect* regeneration is to the spiritual state what perfect health is to the natural," he involves the subject in still deeper and more impenetrable mystery, and assigns to regeneration a quality and function which, in other portions of his treatise, he has reserved for *renovation*. The regeneration which is supposed

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

by him to be imparted in Baptism by the Holy Spirit, is surely perfect—so perfect, at least, as to be denominated *saving*. It is an act which he asserts is accomplished once for ever. ‘There is no such thing as a second Baptism, and it is plain that there can be no such thing as a second new birth, or a second regeneration’ (p. 359). This statement, therefore, plainly precludes the supposition that regeneration is a process involving various stages of advancement, from the less to the more perfect. It is restricted to the moment and act of Baptism, and must, if it exist at all, be perfect from the beginning. But whether it be perfect or not, it is, we are told, incapable of repetition; so that if the grace conveyed in Baptism be lost, it is irrecoverable. In the hands of some of the Fathers, the sin which follows Baptism bars for ever the door of Heaven; and it was chiefly on the ground of the portentous heinousness of post-baptismal sins that Tertullian advocated delay in the administration of the sacrament, and that many of the early Christians deferred it until the close of life.

Dr. Waterland, in another portion of his treatise, informs us that “Regeneration contains grants of remission, justification, adoption, covenant claims to life eternal” (p. 362). “Renovation consists only of a renewal of heart and mind” (*ib.*) These definitions increase rather than remove the perplexity we have already expressed in connexion with the “third case” under review—that is, the case of an adult who has been “*savingly regenerated*,” and who *prior* to his regeneration has been renovated. In what manner then, we may ask, do the privileges which regeneration is alleged to confer—“remission, justification, adoption, covenant claims to life”—stand affected by the declension, temporary or final, of the person baptized? Is the remission recalled—is the justification abolished—is the adoption cancelled—are the covenant claims to life annulled? If their validity remain unshaken by this apostasy, be it transient or permanent, is it conceivable that even a backslider who is in possession of such unspeakable blessings can fail to inherit the kingdom of Heaven? If the grace supposed to be conveyed in Baptism be irrevocable, and includes such transcendent gifts, we know of no higher qualifications that any child of God can possibly

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

possess, or which can impart greater assurance to a man's salvation. If an apostate who has been "*savingly regenerated*" can retain these blessings, we have read the Scriptures in vain ; and if he cannot retain them while his unfaithfulness continues, then he has lost his regeneration, and requires to have it restored by the very process of Baptism through which he realized it at first.

The question at issue here is of the gravest moment, and should not be allowed to be obscured by vague and indefinite expressions. When Dr. Waterland speaks of a regeneration which has been "*decayed*," we look at the constituent elements of that regeneration which he has himself so articulately specified, and are constrained to ask of which of these can we, from its very nature, predicate decay? Can forgiveness be partial? or justification imperfect? or adoption precarious? or covenant claims uncertain? Regeneration, as defined by Waterland, can be neither decadent nor incomplete. It may exist, or it may not exist, but any intermediate predicament is wholly inconceivable, and the regeneration which Baptism is presumed to convey must either abide in its fulness amid apostasy itself,—and then we shall have a forgiven, justified apostate who has covenant claims to life eternal,—or it must be forfeited by such unfaithfulness. In the former case we would ask what is the future condition of the man who in his backsliding retains possession of such ineffable blessings, and in the latter case how can he be reinstated in their enjoyment without the repetition of that very act of Baptism which is alleged to be the ordained channel for their conveyance?

But there is one consideration which we urge finally against the treatise of Waterland, and which, as it seems to us, is equally fatal to any theory of Baptismal Regeneration erected upon this passage in the Epistle to Titus. The *λουτρόν*, however it be interpreted, whether as "*bath*," or "*laver*," or "*washing*," is alleged by Waterland to control all the genitives in the sentence. It is the *λουτρόν* of regeneration and of renewal ; of both equally. If the man be regenerated through it, he is also renewed through it, for the one, *λουτρόν*, if it be cause or medium at all, is cause or medium through which both results are accomplished. There are not *two* washings—one for

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

regeneration, and another for renewal; nor must the two results be separated in point of time, for nothing is affirmed of the efficacy of the laver in one case which is not equally affirmed of it in the other. Whatever elements, therefore, Waterland includes in renewal as distinct from regeneration, do not affect the conclusion that if the λουτρόν denote Baptism, it is through its means that the man is both regenerated and renewed; and so far from having expounded the text, he has contradicted it by insisting that "a change of heart and life" must precede the very laver by which the apostle says it is produced. In short, if the laver of Baptism be meant by the apostle at all, and if he design to teach in the text its causal or instrumental agency, "a renewal of heart and life" anterior to regeneration is an unwarranted theological dogma which is created by the necessities of a theory, but which lacks all scriptural support.

In more recent times, the theory of Dr. Waterland, with some modifications, has been held, among others, by Dr. J. C. Vaughan, who devotes to it a chapter in his small but important volume "On the Revision of the Liturgy." His views, unlike those of Waterland, are stated with a clearness which renders it impossible to misapprehend them, though it is difficult to see in what manner they can be shown to be an adequate exposition of the doctrine of the Prayer Book. Nothing can be wider apart than his exposition and that of Dr. Pusey, which, in his opinion, gives such a sense to the word *regenerate* as "all must recoil from who remember that the Holy Spirit is not a thing, but a person; not a material gift which may lie dormant in a dormant soul to germinate, perhaps years afterwards, in a period of conscious and awakening reason, but a living agent exercising a mysterious but real influence upon living agents, present, as to any scriptural use of that term, only where He is operative, felt in His comfort, or visible in His fruits" (p. 36).

By Baptismal Regeneration, Dr. Vaughan means, and holds his Church to mean, "that change by which a new-born infant is taken out of the world of nature, and transferred by an ordinance of Christ's appointment into the world of grace" (p. 38). Now, whatever be the accuracy of Dr. Vaughan's conception of the nature of baptism (and we believe that he is substantially correct), we cannot but regard his endeavour to harmonize it

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

with the teachings of his Church as a signal failure. It is a garment too short and narrow to cover that ample body of sacramentarianism which is found both in the baptismal offices and in the Catechism ; and it is worthy of notice that he has not brought into view those declarations of the Prayer Book which are chiefly relied on by Dr. Pusey and his followers, and which seem so stubbornly to resist his impoverishing exposition. We feel that those who maintain the inward and spiritual results of Baptismal Regeneration have fair ground of complaint against him for not having tested his theory by those declarations which, we are convinced, would break it in pieces. The blessings supplicated for the child brought to baptism are the remission of sins by *spiritual regeneration*, and that he may be made an heir of everlasting salvation ; and the thanks rendered, after baptism, acknowledge that it hath pleased God to regenerate this infant with His Holy Spirit, to receive him as His child by adoption, and to incorporate him into His holy Church." Of "remission of sins" and "spiritual regeneration" we find no mention whatever in the exposition of Dr. Vaughan, and we find no allusion to the language in the office for Private Baptism, which, so far from restricting regeneration to the mere external introduction of the child into the visible Church, declares that "being born in original sin, and in the wrath of God, he is now, by the laver of regeneration in baptism, received into the number of the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life." The incorporation of the child into the Church, which Dr. Vaughan regards as the sum-total of the benefit conferred in baptism, is mentioned as but the last in a series which he has unaccountably overlooked. To the questions, Is the child's original sin forgiven ? is he delivered from the wrath of God ? is he spiritually regenerated ? is he made the child of God by adoption, and all in baptism ? Dr. Vaughan's chapter contains no reply whatever, and yet, these are the very questions which touch the quick of the whole controversy between Dr. Vaughan and his brethren. The prayers and thanksgivings which the Church offers are egregiously disproportionate to the benefit which he attributes to baptism. Indeed, we see not how any prayer can be needed or justified for the regeneration of the child, if it be no more than its incorporation with the

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

Church, seeing that this union is consummated by the sacrament itself, independent of any spiritual bestowment. We agree with Dr. Blakeney that if the blessing invoked upon the child is not far higher than that alleged by Dr. Vaughan, "words have no meaning" ("The Book of Common Prayer in its History and Interpretation," p. 533). It is noteworthy that Dr. Vaughan denies the *possibility* of the *inward regeneration* of infants, and says, "If you are bidden to believe that a change of heart has taken place in a heart which is incapable of all change, in a little infant which has as yet in exercise no affections, passions, principles, or powers of judgment, refuse there also, refuse resolutely to be imposed upon by names and forms; adhere firmly to those dictates alike of conscience and of Scripture which teach you that the Holy Spirit is a living person, and that, like the wind to which our Lord compares His operation, though *thou canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth*, yet at least *thou hearest the sound thereof*, and judgest of its presence or absence by its manifestations and effects" (p. 37).

Another modification of this objective doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration was propounded by the late lamented F. W. Robertson, of Brighton, whose early death deprived the Church of England of one of her most illustrious sons. His two sermons on Baptism are remarkable on several accounts. They reveal the intensity of that struggle which, on this question, as on many others, he endured for several years, and by which he was driven backwards and forwards, now towards scepticism, and then towards the traditional faith of his Church. They are full of fervent passion, which betrays him unconsciously into misrepresentation both of the theories he so vigorously repudiates, and of that which, though mistakenly, he supposes his Church to hold in common with himself. There is nothing more extraordinary in the life of this great man than the delusion which possessed him that he was defending the doctrine of the Church of England when he was inflicting upon it a succession of fatal wounds.

He assumes as the foundation of his theology, and we believe rightly, that all men are from their very birth the children of God. He then proceeds to affirm that Baptism "does not

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

make the fact of sonship, but only reveals it"* (p. 63). The infant is taught, on the other hand, by his Catechism to say that in his baptism he was *made* a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven." Mr. Robertson expresses it as his opinion that "original sin must be a trifling thing if a little water and a few human words can do away with it,—a trifling thing if, after it is done away, there is no distinguishable difference between the baptized and the unbaptized. If the unbaptized Quaker is just as likely to exhibit the fruits of goodness as the baptized son of the Church of England, we have got out of the land of reality into the domain of figments and speculations. A fictitious guilt is done away with by a fictitious pardon, neither the appearance nor the disappearance being visible" (p. 73).

His Church, on the other hand, certifies that the child "born in original sin, and in the wrath of God, is now by the laver of regeneration in baptism received into the number of the children of God."

Mr. Robertson says, "The superstitious mother of the upper classes baptizes *her* child in all haste, because though she does not precisely know what the mystic effect of baptism is, she thinks it best to be on the safer side, lest her child should die and its eternity should be decided by the omission" (p. 72).

On the other hand, his Church not only proclaims that we become children of God by baptism, but denies Christian burial to all who are unbaptized, and by expressing its undoubting confidence in the salvation of all baptized children *only* who die in infancy, it leaves the rest in an ominous condition of uncertainty, because they are not, in Mr. Robertson's striking and withering phrase, "guarded from God by a ceremony."

Mr. Robertson says "we look to the Bible to corroborate this. In the Acts of the Apostles, Cornelius is baptized. On what grounds?—to manufacture him into a child of God? or *because* he was the child of God? Did his baptism create the fact? or was the fact prior to his baptism, and the ground on which his baptism was valid?" (p. 79.)

On the other hand, if we look *not* to the Bible, but to the Prayer Book, the legalized guide to which alone Mr. Robertson's

* Sermons, Second Series.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

deference was due in all matters of doctrine, we shall find in its Office of Baptism for such as Cornelius, being of riper years, that it addresses them as those who have "now by baptism put on Christ," and urges them seeing that they "*have been made the children of God and of the light*, by faith in Jesus Christ to walk answerably to their Christian calling." The theology of the baptismal offices and of the Catechism is wholly irreconcilable with the assumption that all men are children of God anterior to baptism, and the very position of the Lord's prayer in the services which the Church has prescribed shows that she is at one with the Churches of Chrysostom and Augustine in maintaining that the invocation "Our Father" must not ordinarily be employed except after the Sacrament which has changed a child of wrath into a child of grace.

In his twenty-ninth letter, which was written to the present Archbishop of Dublin, he denominates the Sacramentarian tenets of the Bishop of Exeter on the baptismal question as "incantation, and not Christianity," confessing, however, that they have been held by a large number of the Church's leading divines, though he trusts that "he would lose anything on earth rather than teach them or believe them" (*Life of Robertson*, vol. ii., pp. 69, 70).

We have no doubt that Mr. Robertson was perfectly honest in his heroic conviction, and that martyrdom would have had no terror to him compared with that of avowing a creed which his conscience reprobated; but none the less confidently do we assert that his peculiar interpretation of the baptismal offices was never admitted, nor even conceived, in any previous age of the Church, and could never be adopted so long as the function of language is the expression of truth, and not its concealment or perversion.

II.

THE OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE THEORY, WHICH REPRESENTS THE INTERNAL EFFECTS OF BAPTISM WHEN RIGHTLY ADMINISTERED AS INVARIABLY PRODUCED, THOUGH PRECARIOUS AS TO THEIR CONTINUANCE.

Of this view Dr. Pusey is the most eminent modern representative, and our observations will be confined almost exclusively to him. The following citations from the fourth and

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

enlarged edition of his tract on Baptism will enable the reader to form a sufficiently accurate notion of his tenets on the question before us.

"Regeneration is the gift of God, bestowed by Him in this life, in baptism only" (p. 42).

"Our blessed Saviour's words refuse to be bound down to any mere *outward* change of state, or circumstances, or relation, however glorious the privileges of that new condition may be" (pp. 42, 43).

"As the one birth is real, so must the other be; the agents truly are different, and so also is the character of life produced by each. In the one case, physical agents, and so physical life, desires, powers; and since from a corrupted author, powers weakened and corrupted; in the other, the Holy Spirit of God, and so spiritual life, strength, faculties, energies; still in either case a real existence, and to the Christian a new, real, though not merely physical beginning—an existence real, though invisible—and though worked by an unseen agent, yet (when not stifled) felt in its effects, like the energy of the viewless winds" (p. 44).

"But a commencement of life in Christ after baptism, a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness at any other period than of that one introduction into God's covenant, is as little consonant with the general representations of Holy Scripture as a commencement of physical life long after our natural birth, is with the order of His providence" (p. 28).

The terms in which Dr. Pusey writes are definite and strong. He seems to have diligently searched for forms of expression which shall set forth the inward results of Baptism in the most striking fashion. It is not the surface of the soul that is touched. The changes it works are unlike every other change. Repentance is important, but it is more radical than repentance. It surpasses "faith and life, and love,"—includes them all, and far more (p. 47). It produces new desires and affections. The regeneration which baptism conveys becomes thus an active energy in the child which impels the soul Godward; and it is further a divine product which becomes historically bound up with the ordinance of Baptism so stringently and indissolubly that it is as natural to expect "physical life" to

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

begin after our "natural birth" as regeneration after the administration of this Christian rite. If regeneration, therefore, be necessary to salvation, and it is imparted in Baptism, and at no other time, and in no other manner, then it is clear that Dr. Pusey shuts the door of heaven against all who have not received the baptismal rite, or, at best, consigns them to the unrevealed and uncovenanted mercies of God. When we see the fearful extent over which the result of such a theory spreads, and the multitudes whose eternal prospects it puts in jeopardy; and when, moreover, we see that not a few among these multitudes have been men illustrious for faith, devoutness, purity, beneficence, charity, heroic defence of truth and freedom, unselfishness, love for their Saviour, and for the race whom He came to redeem, we more than suspect the divinity of a dogma fraught with such consequences as this inevitably carries with it. And it would require very explicit teaching on the part of Christ and His apostles, teaching direct, and as far as possible unfigurative, harmonizing, too, most palpably with the whole scheme of evangelical truth, to warrant us in accepting a sacramentarian theory which, in addition to its violation of charity, is in marked collision with the facts observable in society around us. Such teaching, however, Dr. Pusey alleges that we have, and we now proceed to consider it.

The first instance is supplied in the conversation of our Lord with Nicodemus, and is regarded as so firm a pillar of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration as held by Dr. Pusey, that he says, "I would gladly rest the whole question on this one consideration" (p. 41). "Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii. 5).

This language is unquestionably most express. It proclaims as clearly as words can proclaim anything that a birth other than the natural is needed for entrance into the kingdom of God; and that this birth is "of water and the spirit." These are the words, but we have now to do with their interpretation. While we do not deny that the Patristic testimony in favour of their allusion to Baptism, and to Regeneration by its means, is practically unanimous, it is but fair to record the fact that Baptism itself is not explicitly mentioned in the words of our Lord to Nicodemus, and that it only finds its place in them by

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

interpretation. The word water occurs and it may mean the water of Baptism, but this is an inference, and must not be urged without reason as an undoubted and exclusive equivalent to Baptism. The employment in Scripture of the emblem of water, aloof altogether from the ordinance of Baptism, is a circumstance which assuredly can scarcely admit of question. When God said to His ancient Church by the mouth of His prophet Ezekiel, "When I entered into covenant with thee, and thou becamest mine, then washed I thee with water," are we to imagine that Israel was sacramentally regenerated? And when David in his penitential Psalm cries piteously to God, "Wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow," is not his allusion plainly to the purifying power of water? But where lay the defilement from which he sought to be freed? Was it not in his soul? Did he not supplicate a "clean heart" and a "right spirit"? And these were to be created within him by that washing which would leave him "whiter than snow," and by that purging with hyssop which would make him clean. But who supposes that David invested the water or the branch of hyssop with any regenerative virtue, or that he thought of either as being more than material symbols of that deep spiritual renewal which he supplicates with so much energy and pathos from the Holy Spirit? Would Dr. Pusey accept the reasoning of one who because the Psalmist in one and the same sentence says, "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean," should maintain that the ritual operation described in the former part of the sentence was productive of the spiritual effect declared in the latter? And yet the inference would not be one whit more precarious and unwarranted than that by which he infers, not only that by the water of which our Lord speaks, He means *Baptism*, but that He teaches that it is the sacramental condition and medium through which is realized the birth of the Holy Spirit. Will it be said that in our Lord's words there is on the one hand a material substance, and on the other a high spiritual effect?—we reply that the same combination is found in the words of the Psalmist. We have a material substance—hyssop; and we have a high spiritual effect, "cleansing," and that too of the soul, for the body plays no part in this inspired wail which has been the chosen vehicle

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

of penitential sorrow and aspiration in all ages of the Church: It requires no ingenuity, but simply the application of Dr. Pusey's own principle of interpretation, to ground upon the words of the Psalmist a doctrine of sacramental efficacy which shall teach that the glorious blessing of spiritual purification ensues on "being purged with hyssop." The *nexus* between the outward ceremony and the inward effect is as strict in David's words as in those of our Lord to Nicodemus. It is even more so, for while our Saviour does not affirm that whosoever is "born of water" will be "born of the spirit," the Psalmist distinctly declares that if "purged with hyssop" he would "be clean." If it be thought that the parallelism of these passages can be disturbed by alleging that the words of David are palpably figurative, it will then remain to be shown that there is no figure in the language of our Lord to Nicodemus, and this too in the face of the fact declared in Scripture, and admitted by all, that the teaching of our Saviour was parabolic in its character, and was manifestly tropical in its colouring, even where the ordinary form of parable was not employed.

But the figurative use of the word "*water*" as denoting the spiritual agency through which cleansing is accomplished, is seen in the language of the New Testament as well as in that of the old. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, v. 25, 26, the apostle exhorts "husbands to love their wives as Christ loved His Church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify it and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." The washing of water by which this transcendent beauty and perfectness of the Church is produced is said to be "by the word," and presents the same truth as that which our Lord embodied in His prayer for His disciples: "Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy word is truth."

And yet even this passage is pressed into service, as an ally of sacramentarianism, by Dr. Pusey, through a restricted interpretation of the expression *ῥήματι* (the word), which he alleges to be the word of consecration, or the baptismal formula (p. 198). He denies that *ῥῆμα* is used to set forth the revelation of God in general, and cites in support of his opinion "the authority of the ancient Church." We demur to his opinion,

and its supporting authority, and this on evidence superior to both. Nothing can be more conclusive on this point than the language of St. Peter in his first epistle (i. 22—25), in which he speaks of those to whom he writes as having purified their souls through obeying the truth (τῆς ἀληθείας), as having been born again of the word of God (λόγου), and as having the word (ῥῆμα) of God which abideth for ever preached as gospel (εὐαγγελισθῆν) to them. Can Dr. Pusey seriously imagine that the ῥῆμα here is not the gospel system of truth, but only some "command" or "promise"? So far from ῥῆμα denoting the baptismal formula, the apostle does not use it in the very sentence in which it might have yielded some argumentative support to Dr. Pusey—that is, where he says "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, even the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." It is not ῥῆμα, but λόγος, which is said here to be the incorruptible seed, in harmony with our Saviour's language in which he tells us that the seed of the sower was the word (ὁ λόγος) of God. The mistake, therefore, into which Dr. Pusey has fallen is two-fold, for not only is ῥῆμα not restricted to some "command" or "promise," or a "specific revelation," but it is *not* the expression which denotes the baptismal formula, even if St. Peter were imagined to have the remotest reference to the sacrament in this passage.

But another clear refutation of Dr. Pusey's position respecting the meaning of the word ῥῆμα is supplied in Ephesians vi. 17: "and take the helmet of salvation, which is the word (ῥῆμα) of God," an expression which cannot be confounded with the baptismal formula, but must refer to that word of God "which is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword." That this is its meaning according to St. Chrysostom the Doctor will find by referring to the Father's comments upon the passage, in which he makes no allusion to the baptismal formula, but expressly identifies it with the oracles of God. And, further, the same Father, in interpreting the expression in Hebrews vi. 4, "And have tasted of the good word of God" (ῥῆμα θεοῦ) does not connect it with the baptismal formula, but makes it refer to *teaching* or *doctrine* (τὴν διδασκαλίαν).*

* Chrys. Op. Edit. Front. Ducaeus, vol. iv., p. 782.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

These considerations justify us in hesitating to defer to Dr. Pusey's judgment, either on the "peculiarity of Scripture language," or on "the authority of the ancient Church," both of which he has here so unadvisedly invoked in support of a strained and fantastic interpretation. Indeed, we are compelled to add, in general, with regard to his method of citing the Fathers, that nothing can be less satisfactory, for while in no instance have we found him imputing to any of them a sentiment which is not in their works, he once and again ignores other and inconsistent sentiments which fully counterpoise those which he adduces.*

(2.) From the question which our Saviour asked, as if in astonishment at the ignorance of Nicodemus, "Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?" we may derive some help towards the interpretation of the words now under consideration. What were the things which it was somewhat discreditable in a master in Israel not to know? Clearly, those things of which Christ had just spoken touching the necessity for the new birth. A master in Israel should have known, and that too as a member of the Jewish Church, who was presumably educated in the truths already revealed, that a man "must be born again,"—"must be born of water and the Spirit,"—that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." The truths embodied in these words were not surely new on that night when Nicodemus held this thrilling interview with his Lord. They were not meant to be disclosures of spiritual verities hitherto unknown. The whole emphasis of our Saviour's wondering question would be lost unless He had been recapitulating to the thoughtful ruler truths that found a place in the Jewish economy itself. "That which had been born of the flesh," had always been "flesh;" and that which had been "born of the Spirit," had always been "spirit." And both

* On Ephesians vi. 17, see Meyer, p. 276. Dieses Schwerdt ist das Wort Gottes, das Evangelium dessen Inhalt der Geist dem Bewusstsein des Christen lebendig vermittelt, damit dieser durch die göttliche Kraft des Evangel (Rom. i. 10) sich gegen die Angriffe der teuflischen Gewalten, vertheidige und sie überwinde, wie der Krieger mit dem Schwerdt den Feind abwehrt, i. 2 berwindet.

On 1 Petri und eü25, Meyer observes, in direct opposition to the opinion of Dr. Pusey, τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθεν. Umschreibung des Evangelium.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

species of births, the higher as well as the lower, together with the necessity for the higher, are treated as acknowledged realities, not merely in the Christian dispensation, but in that which it had come partly to fulfil, and partly to supersede. And whether Nicodemus knew the purport of our Saviour's language or not, its force is not in the least diminished by his ignorance, as the implication still remains, that as a Jew he he *ought* to have been too well acquainted with the need of regeneration to require the instruction which he had now received from the lips of Christ. That spiritual regeneration, then, or, in other words, the birth from above, ἀνωθεν, was a truth not first brought to light by the incarnate Word, but a fact in the experience of Jews in ancient days is an inference deducible, as we think, without any illicit strain from the words of Jesus. "The new heart," "the right spirit," "the clean heart," "the heart of flesh," in contradistinction to "a heart of stone," are as much insisted on in one form or another in the Psalms, and some of the Prophets, as they are in the New Testament; and the source of these in God is as clearly recognized. Moreover, the expression of our Saviour, "except a man be born again," ἐὰν μὴ τις, cannot without stronger reasons than we have yet seen be confined to any dispensational arrangement, but is so universal in its sweep as to include all men whatsoever. There is a kingdom of Heaven on the one hand, and there is a spiritual fitness to "see it," or "to enter it," on the other; and that fitness cannot be supposed to have been first possible and necessary *after the day of Pentecost* unless we are prepared to affirm either that the kingdom of God had no existence until then, or that neither patriarch nor prophet had ever entered it. That Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are in the kingdom of Heaven is not a matter of inference, but of explicit teaching on the part of our Lord Himself. They have not only seen it as from afar, but have entered it, and are seated there as the nucleus of a goodly company that "shall come from the East and the West." Either then they have reached the kingdom without regeneration, because without baptism, as Sacramentarians in the face of their own exposition must maintain, or they have obtained a regeneration which is independent of baptism. If the former, then there is

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

a salvation without regeneration ; if the latter, then there is a regeneration without baptism.

(3.) Another consideration, which of itself is fatal to the doctrine now under discussion, is supplied by the fact that, according to the theory of the Sacramentarians, the baptism which could regenerate was inaugurated only on the day of Pentecost, when, as they allege, the water first became divinely imbued with its mystic power. The baptism which was administered by John, and that which was administered by the apostles of our Lord prior to the day of Pentecost, were destitute of any saving energy, and therefore at the time when Nicodemus, urged by a deep sense of his spiritual necessities sought this interview with the Teacher come from God, no baptism unto life was known. The mere statement of such a position should be its own refutation, for it implies that however earnest might be the desire of Nicodemus to inherit the kingdom of God, the door at that time was not yet opened, and that he must wait amid all the uncertainties which hung around his life, as they hang around the life of every man, until the waters of baptism should be endowed with their renewing power. In what manner can this be reconciled with the exhortations of our Lord "to seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness"? Or, how should we vindicate the candour of Him who "did no sin," and in "whose mouth was found no guile," if He urged as a matter of supreme moment the seeking of a kingdom which did not exist, and which therefore no passionateness of quest could find until the miraculous effusion of the Holy Spirit? Our Lord assuredly spoke on the mountain side to the multitudes of a *present* necessity, and a *present* and *accessible* blessing. But present and accessible it was not, if the entrance into the kingdom depended on a regeneration effected in baptism, and if the baptism which was to exert this marvellous power was not to be instituted for some time to come. This theory of the Anglicans, moreover, seems to imperil the salvation of the apostles who were appointed during our Saviour's personal ministry, and to nullify their claims. For, on the supposition that they had been baptized, still their baptism having taken place prior to the day of Pentecost could not have imparted

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

to them that spiritual nature which according to the High Anglican and Romish theory became possible only after the effusion of the Holy Ghost. But error always prepares entanglements for the feet of its supporters. It does so here; for, while it should follow from the dogma we are now examining that all baptisms that preceded the ascension of our Lord lacked the regenerative grace, and therefore the essential qualification for admission into the kingdom of God, it is nevertheless recorded that "even publicans and harlots were entering the kingdom," that "the kingdom of Heaven was suffering violence, and that the violent were taking it by force;" in other words, that they were either becoming the subjects of the kingdom without the new birth, or else were obtaining the new birth without *that* baptism to which is attributed the exclusive virtue of conveying it.

(4.) It deserves consideration that in founding the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration upon the words of our Lord to Nicodemus, Dr. Pusey has not merely interpreted the word *water* as meaning *baptism*, but he has assumed that a connexion subsists between the birth of water and of the Spirit, which is certainly not declared in the words themselves. Let it be conceded that the water denotes baptism. We have then the doctrine that except a man be born of baptism and of the Holy Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven. Here two conditions are affirmed to be essential to salvation; and this is all. No dependence of the one condition on the other is predicated. They are simply essential, but neither the one nor the other is affirmed to be either cause or effect. It is not hinted that they take place at the same moment. It is not alleged that he who is born of water will also be born of the Spirit; nor that he who is born of the Spirit must as a condition be born of water. Two circumstances may be co-essential in order to the attainment of a certain end, and yet be wholly independent of each other. It may be true that except a man be strong both in body and in mind he cannot realize the highest enjoyment in life, but it certainly will not follow that vigour in one will necessarily produce vigour in the other. And in firmly, but respectfully, protesting against the interpretation which introduces a strictness of relation and dependence into the two

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

elements mentioned by our Lord which they do not possess, we are supported by facts of the most conclusive character drawn from the history of the early Church.

We have, in the first place, the case of baptism without its being accompanied by the gift of the Holy Spirit. For when Philip the Deacon was preaching to the Samaritans "the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." And it was not till some time afterwards that the apostles, having heard of the success which had attended Philip's labours, sent Peter and John, who, on their arrival, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost; and the outward symbol that was employed in the bestowment of this heavenly gift was, not baptism, but the laying on of hands. The baptism they had received was post-Pentecostal; it was also in the name of the Lord Jesus, but it failed to convey the Holy Spirit.

We have, in the second place, an instance of divorce between the act of baptism and the impartation of the Spirit of an exactly opposite kind, in which baptism did not precede but follow that bestowment. For while the apostle was preaching to Cornelius and his company, the Holy Ghost fell on them that heard the word, and fell too with such demonstrations of His presence that they of the circumcision were astonished "because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." And it was then that Peter said, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? and that he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." If, therefore, we have, in the first instance, baptism preceding the gift of the Holy Spirit by an interval too long to admit of the supposition that there was any connexion between them; and if, in the second, we have the gift of the Spirit preceding baptism, and that too by an interval equally significant, it is clear that the interpretation which assumes the contemporaneousness of regeneration with baptism, and still more its causal dependence upon it, is rebuked by the most unambiguous records of the early Church. A connexion cannot be necessary which sometimes does not exist, and one thing cannot be the uniform cause or condition of another, if it sometimes precedes and

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

sometimes follows it, and if (which is more important still) it sometimes neither precedes nor follows it; for the thief on the cross was baptized neither before his conversion nor after it, or, if he were, there is no trace of it in the Evangelic narratives. This malefactor, whose conversion anticipated his death but a few moments, has been a sore and perplexing problem to all the maintainers of Baptismal Regeneration from the days of Cyprian downwards. The certainty of his future blessedness, assured by the lips of Him who had the keys of Hades and of death, seemed so seriously to jeopardize the claims of baptism to be the one indispensable key to the kingdom, that various expedients have been devised to give the repenting thief the benefit of that ordinance. Cyprian reckoned him amongst the martyrs by a curious enlargement of the conception of martyrdom, and declared him to be baptized in his own blood, a species of regeneration invented by the Fathers, without one atom of inspired authority. Augustine seems to have reached no fixed opinion; as in his treatise on Baptism against the Donatists, he supposes the thief was not baptized;* and in his treatise "On the Soul and its Origin,"† he claims the liberty of holding that there might fall upon him drops from the wounded side of our Saviour; or, failing this explanation, he assumes that he was baptized before his conviction and imprisonment. To such perverse ingenuity were these Fathers reduced for the purpose of supporting their extreme hypothesis of the indispensableness of baptism to salvation.

In confirmation of the reasoning contained in this fourth consideration, we may cite the testimony of Mr. Mozley, himself a believer in the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, but who denounces as worthless the very pillar on which Dr. Pusey is willing to rest the whole weight of the doctrine! The singular identity of thought, and almost of expression, between what follows and what we have just advanced, renders it necessary to say that our reply to Dr. Pusey was finished before Mr. Mozley's book came to hand.

"Great stress," he says, "has been laid in the baptismal controversy, on our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus; and the

* August. Opera., Editio. Bened., Paris, 1835, vol. ix., p. 244.

† Ib., vol. x., p. 700.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

text, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,' is often quoted to prove the literal conveyance of regeneration in baptism. But if persons would attend to the simple construction of this sentence and to the statement made in it, instead of going off upon one phrase, 'born of water and the Spirit,' they would see that this text does not assert anything of the kind which they think it does. For this text does not say that every one who is born of the water is born of the Spirit, but that those who are born of water, *and* are born of the Spirit, shall enter into the kingdom of God, or have what is necessary for the entrance. This latter statement is a totally different one from the former, and does not the least imply, or contain it. It asserts two conditions for entering into the kingdom of God; but it does not say that a person who has fulfilled one of these conditions has fulfilled the other. There is one condition said to be necessary for this purpose, viz., 'being born of water,'—that is, being baptized; and so far as this text asserts this condition, it simply asserts what all parties agree in, that baptism is generally necessary for salvation. There is another condition pronounced to be necessary, viz., 'being born of the Spirit,'—and that also is universally admitted. Then what does this text assert, but what all parties agree in, viz., the necessity of regeneration, and the necessity (by all interpreted to be only *general*) of baptism? Thus much is clear from the simple construction of the sentence. But take, in addition, the *meaning* of 'being born of the Spirit,' and 'being born again,' and another reason will appear, and that an irresistible one, why this text cannot be interpreted to signify that whoever is baptized is born of the Spirit, and born again. For, 'being born again,' and 'being born of the Spirit,' involve in their Scriptural meaning, as I have shown, actual holiness and goodness, and not merely the capacity for them; and all the baptized are *not* holy and good persons.*

And we find Dr. C. J. Vaughan, while admitting the possibility of another interpretation, holding that the "water" is emblematic. "This regeneration," he says, "is described as effected *by water, and by the Spirit*. Even as elsewhere the

* Mozley on Baptismal Regeneration, Preface, p. xxxv.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

work of Christ on the human soul is described as a baptism *with the Holy Ghost, and with fire*; that is, with the Holy Ghost in the character as of fire, burning up corruption, and kindling the soul with a new energy of life and light;” so here the same work is described as “a regeneration *with water, and with the Spirit*; with the Holy Spirit in the character of cleansing and purifying water, washing the soul from its defilements and refreshing it as with a cool and invigorating stream. *With the Holy Ghost and with fire* is the one figure; *with water and with the Spirit* is the other. And I know not that we need see in the original address to Nicodemus anything of a more formal or ritual character. I know not that the words would convey to his mind more than this idea of an impressive and appropriate figure. If so, the expression there employed, and the appointed sign of water in baptism, will become two co-ordinate testimonies, the one by word, the other by act, of the same great necessity of an inward and spiritual cleansing. Just as the discourse in the 6th chapter of St. John’s Gospel upon the living bread from heaven, and the appointed sign of the broken bread in the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper, express, the one in word, and the other in act, the same spiritual truth,—the necessity that our souls should be sustained in life, by receiving into them daily, by faith, the very presence of their Saviour Christ.”*

Another passage which Dr. Pusey regards as affording scarcely less support to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration than that we have just considered, is Titus iii. 5: “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He hath saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.”

Apart altogether from the bearing of this passage on the question of Baptismal Regeneration, its very structure presents such difficulties as to have divided the critical world. Dr. Pusey, for example, considers that the washing or laver extends both to the regeneration and the renewing, and accordingly translates the passage “by the washing of regeneration and of renewing of the Holy Ghost.” Dean Alford, on the other hand, alleges that the great formal objection to this is “the de-

* Revision of the Liturgy, by C. J. Vaughan, D.D., pp. 31, 32.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

struction of the balance of the sentence, in which *παλιγγενεσίας* would be one genitive, and *ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου* the other. The far greater contextual objection is that thus the whole from *παλιγγενεσίας* to *ἁγίου*, would be included under *λουτροῦ*, and baptism made not only the seal of the new birth, but the sacrament of progressive sanctification.* Accordingly, he would render the passage "by the laver of regeneration, and by (*δια* being understood) the renewal of the Holy Spirit." The learned commentator understands the first member of the sentence to refer to baptism, but with such explanations of his views touching the nature of the ordinance, that between our position and his there is scarcely the breadth of a hair. "It is not," he says, "the mere outward act or fact of baptism to which we attach such high and glorious epithets, but that complete baptism by water and the Holy Ghost, whereof the first cleansing by water is indeed the ordinary sign and seal, but whereof the glorious indwelling Spirit of God is the only efficient cause and continuous agent. Baptismal Regeneration is the distinguishing doctrine of the new covenant (Matt. iii. 2); but let us take care that we know and bear in mind what *baptism* means; not the mere ecclesiastical act among God's professing people, but that completed by the Divine act, manifested by the operation of the Holy Ghost in the heart and through the life."

If the allusion be to baptism at all as an outward rite, it is to baptism viewed as an emblem of that inward spiritual purification which is accomplished in the soul by the Holy Spirit, and which, so far from being the product of "the laver," is not seen in one out of a hundred of those who have submitted to the ordinance.

If we accept the rendering of Dr. Pusey, which makes the genitives *παλιγγενεσίας* and *ἀνακαινώσεως* depend on the laver, *λουτρόν*, then the apostle teaches us that the laver through which we are saved is one which issues in *regeneration* and *renewal*; and as these denote moral and spiritual results which must be seen in the outward life, we conclude that no man can have been saved by *that* laver on whom the fruits of godliness are not found.

* Alford's Greek Test., vol. iii., p. 399.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

Upon the two passages just considered—the language of our Lord to Nicodemus, and the language of Paul to Titus, Dr. Pusey mainly builds his doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. To others, however, he attaches considerable weight, and at some of these we propose briefly to glance. He cites, for example, the words of St. Peter in his first epistle (ch. iii. 21): “The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.”

We confess our inability to see the support which this passage can yield to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. The figure is marked by considerable obscurity whatever view be taken of the ritual teaching of the passage, and yet there is no lack of explicitness as to the sort of baptism to which the apostle refers. It is a baptism which saves, and because it is a baptism that saves, St. Peter sharply marks it off by a negation from a baptism which does not save, because consisting only “in putting away the filth of the flesh.” It is *not* this exterior ablution, but it is the answer of a good conscience toward God.” The salvation then is not a baptism, nor is it the consequence of a baptism, which is merely outward; and we can scarcely conceive of the apostle selecting language which could be better fitted to preclude the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. The ceremonial and the moral, so far from being brought together as being respectively cause and consequence, are opposed to each other, or, if not opposed, the ceremonial is dismissed from the view of the apostle and his readers, that the moral may stand more vividly before them. The apostle is, in fact, comparing with each other two salvations,—one, that of the eight who were preserved in the ark by the power of God amid the waters of the deluge; and another, that of all who are saved by a spiritual baptism, which does not consist in the cleansing of the body, but of the soul. As the ark which Noah prepared was the means of saving those whom the Lord shut in, so in the gospel economy spiritual baptism, which renovates the heart, is an ark, the true antitype, by which believers are saved from the perils of sin. If the thought of baptism by

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

water were in his mind at all, it was that he might keep it in its subordinate position as an emblem of that glorious cleansing which purifies the soul. If the baptism with water were the constituted antecedent and medium of spiritual regeneration, the careful and admonitory distinction which he here makes would be superfluous, for where there was the former there would be also the latter, and it would be useless to warn against the shadow if the substance were invariably connected with it.

Considerable stress is laid by Dr. Pusey on the words (Mark xvi. 16), "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned."

We do not press the consideration, which however it is but right to mention, that this verse did not proceed from the pen of St. Mark. The utmost extent to which any fair interpretation of the words can go is to elicit from them the teaching that faith and baptism are both essential to salvation; and the degree of essentiality attached to baptism is, we hold, exactly the same as that attached to confession with the mouth in the language of the apostle Paul: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Salvation is here connected as a result with two conditions,—one inward, faith; the other outward, confession with the mouth; but surely confession with the mouth will not be esteemed by any a saving or regenerating operation. The confession of the Lord Jesus is the outward affirmation of what is in the heart in the shape of faith, and would be delusion or hypocrisy if there were not in the heart the faith which it formally avows. In the interpretation of the Scriptures it is well that a due regard be paid to the general stress of its teaching, as there is scarcely one heresy which cannot find in some individual passage or other a plausible support. Arianism pleads as decisive the phrase "The firstborn of every creature." Socinianism, "There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." A fatalistic Calvinism rings out the loud monotone (disregardful of truths which supply a harmony), "Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" Salvation by

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

works shelters itself under the words of St. James. Materialism reminds us of the language of Job: "Man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" And even absolute scepticism cites the preacher: "All things come alike to all, there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked." In the language of the New Testament, taken as a whole, there is what according to the language of Mathematics we may denominate the constant, and there is also the variable. The constant is faith. The variable element sometimes appears in the shape of confession, sometimes of baptism, and in the great majority of instances it does not appear at all. To assert the absolute essentiality of that which is variable, and frequently absent altogether, and what is more, to insist that it possesses the same kind of indispensableness as that which attaches to the constant, is to adopt a canon of Hermeneutics which, happily for the credit of our theological science, has never yet been accounted legitimate or safe. That the constant in the conditions of our salvation is faith will scarcely be doubted. The jailor was assured that he would be saved by faith. "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." "By grace are ye saved through faith." "Whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life." To cite all the passages in which faith alone sustains the function of appropriating and securing salvation would be to incorporate in this essay a considerable portion of the New Testament; but, instances in which baptism by water alone saves us we have found none.

III.

THE OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE THEORY, WHICH REPRESENTS THE INTERNAL EFFECTS OF BAPTISM WHEN RIGHTLY ADMINISTERED AS OCCASIONALLY PRODUCED, BUT AS PERMANENT IN THEIR CONTINUANCE.

We come next to consider a view of Baptismal Regeneration which is widely contrasted with the one which has just passed under review. Its most able expounder in modern times is the Rev. J. B. Mozley, whose works on Predestination, and Baptismal Regeneration, and Miracles, whatever be the extent of our concurrence with the views which they contain, must ever

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

occupy a high place in the literature to which they belong. The benefits of baptism he holds to be both objective and subjective, but the subjective benefits, he maintains, are in reality only occasional. While, however, they are only occasional, they are absolutely indestructible, and secure the final salvation of the soul. In other words, the truly regenerated are the elect or predestinated alone, all others of the baptized being regenerated only on the principle of a "*high supposition*"—a principle which, whether valid or not, has provoked more indignant denunciation from the High Sacramentarian party in the Church of England than any other. It is regarded as a theory which imports precariousness into what the Church meant to be certain, hypothesis into what the Church meant to be assured and unexceptionable declaration. Mr. Keble, in his sermons on the Baptismal Offices, published under the eye of Dr. Pusey, has found his usual placidity greatly disturbed by the apparition of this *high supposition* device, and by every kindred theory which seems to qualify in anywise the confident and unconditional assurances of the baptismal offices. He recurs to such emasculating expositions once and again, but delivers himself most warmly in his thirtieth sermon, when treating of the "thanksgiving after baptism." These are his words: "Instead of saying '*we hope*,' we say positively '*it is regenerate*;' we say it concerning every child; no distinction is made between this and that one. Why should we say it, if we are not to believe it? Surely the Church meant us all to believe it, and if we will be true churchmen, we must believe it. I say it over and over again, and I wish you to take notice of it, and always to remember it, that over every child, without exception, immediately after it has been baptized, the priest is desired to say, '*This child is regenerate*,' not, '*it may be*,' or '*we hope it is*,' but plainly and distinctly '*it is*.' Supposing any person should come up at the same moment and say, '*Perhaps it is not so; we cannot tell; we can only hope it is so*,' would you not say that that person contradicts the Prayer Book? Surely the matter is so plain that no one can help perceiving it unless he chooses to be blind, and we ought to be very thankful that the matter is so plain; for, unhappily, there are too many who for various reasons wish to make it out that we need

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

not believe all infants to be regenerated in baptism. . . . And to make it, if possible, still more distinct, observe what we are directed to say when a child is brought to church that has been christened at home. The priest takes *it* also in his arms, and makes the sign of the cross in the regular form ; but when he invites the people to give thanks, instead of saying, ' This child is regenerate,' he says, ' This child is by baptism regenerate,' not by the prayers of its friends and sponsors, nor by some unknown gift before baptism, but by baptism itself. What can be plainer ?" *

The imputation here cast upon those who adopt the hypothetical rendering of the language of the Prayer Book is by no means in harmony with the generally tender and gentle spirit of the author of the "Christian Year," but it evinces the intensity of his conviction that the language of his Church was meant to be taken without qualification. The regeneration of the child is here scrupulously dissociated both from *pre-venient* grace, and from the pleadings of friends, and traced exclusively to the baptism itself. The poles are not wider from each other than the views represented by Mr. Keble and Mr. Mozley, and yet the latter, so far from allowing that "he chooses to be blind," vigorously upholds his interpretation of the Prayer Book not only as allowable, or as consistent, or as adequate, but as that which was intended by its compilers. The weight of the *primâ facie* evidence is strongly against him ; and yet, as his views are entitled to a hearing, we now proceed as briefly as possible to present them. This task is the less difficult as Mr. Mozley has not allowed his views to be gathered, and that doubtfully, from his elaborate treatise, but has formulated them at the outset with a distinctness of language and method which enables the reader at once to see what are the positions he means to maintain. He affirms, in the first place, that Regeneration implies in the primitive sense real and actual goodness, in direct contradiction to Waterland and Vaughan ; in the second place, that Regeneration implies final goodness as distinguished from goodness for the time being ; in the third place, that it is an imparted goodness as distinguished from an acquired goodness ; and in the fourth place, that it is not the less real or actual

* Pp. 274, 275.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

goodness because it is imparted. In the process of his argument the following positions are affirmed, which, though not directed by name against Waterland, are clearly subversive of his views. Regeneration stands for the greatest change in the condition of the *moral* creature (p. 3). It is not the being endowed with additional capacities and means for a good life alone, as these are seen in a vast portion of those who possess them to produce no change whatever; but is a change in *ourselves*, a change of moral character (p. 3). He cautions his readers in express terms against regarding regeneration as a capacity for holiness, instead of holiness itself. "The washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost," he declares to be one and the same thing, and he denies that any man can be regenerated who is not also renewed (p. 6). To be a son of God he holds to be equivalent to being good, and "necessarily and finally good," regeneration being identical with the practical reign of faith and love in the soul (pp. 7, 8). He makes mention of two regenerations, a higher and a lower, the former denoting "a future and heavenly state of goodness after trial is passed and all alloy removed," and the latter taking place "in this life" (p. 18). The regeneration in the lower sense he identifies with *conversion*. "Certain conditions," he says, are required, according to Scripture, for regeneration, viz., repentance and faith, that is to say, change of heart and life; upon which change, or what is commonly called conversion, taking place in the individual, regeneration is supposed to be conferred upon him in the ordinance of baptism" (p. 19). "Conversion is a change of heart for the time being, regeneration is this change fixed and secured, which is the proper reward of such a change, for the best reward it can have is its own perpetuation" (p. 19).

Mr. Mozley here suffers himself to fall into confusion, for while he started with making a change of moral character one of the distinctive and essential elements in regeneration itself, he now makes a change of both heart and life essential to *conversion*, and by making conversion essential to baptism, and baptism essential to regeneration, we have, in fact, a moral change accomplished anterior to the ordinance which is the instituted means for its production. In alleging that repentance

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

and faith, that is to say, a change of heart and life, is necessary as a condition of regeneration, there are some important considerations which he has overlooked. Is not *salvation* itself declared to be the "sure reward" of such a change? Can there be repentance and faith without salvation? And can there be repentance and faith, that is, *conversion*, without the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit? And is not a soul, on the authority of St. James, as much saved from death by *conversion* as by *regeneration*? And are not the results of conversion therefore as lofty and enduring as those of regeneration? When the apostle, as he informs the elders of the Church of Ephesus, preached repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, that is, according to Mr. Mozley, when he preached the elements of *conversion*, did he withhold anything which was necessary to regeneration? or did he assume that repentance and faith were in themselves the very essence of regeneration? It is certain that the apostle accounts himself as having published to them all that was indispensable to salvation in having inculcated faith and repentance; and regeneration must have been included in these, or inseparably connected with them. Between a converted man—a man that is (according to Mr. Mozley's definition) changed in heart and life, and a regenerate man, the apostle sees no distinction. His exhortation to the jailor clearly shows that in his estimation faith in the Lord Jesus Christ was sufficient as a condition for salvation. And it would be interesting to us to see in what manner Mr. Mozley would explain the language of the apostle to the Corinthians, language which assuredly reveals his estimate of the relative value of the two things he compares when he thanks God that he had baptized so few, "because Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Mr. Mozley will not deny that conversion is the designed result of the latter agency—the preaching of the gospel. But what if conversion be a precarious and perishable change? What, if its roots are so superficial that it can be overthrown by some tempest of temptation, and that it needs to be established by a regeneration which is imparted in baptism? In this case, the apostle is more than satisfied that he has accomplished a service which *may* leave no abiding effects whatsoever, and

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

that he has abstained from the administration of that very ordinance whose declared and specific function it is to invest a man's conversion with the attribute of immortality. His mission was to preach a salvation which should be eternal life, and he has omitted the one sacrament in which it is made eternal. No photographer who had succeeded in taking an exact portrait would boast that he deliberately neglected to fix it, for it is just this process of arresting finally the features of a man which has taxed so much the patience and skill of science; and yet the apostle having changed "a man's heart and life," thanks God that he has given the slightest and most exceptional attention to the sacrament which seals a man for heaven. The permanence of a change is surely as important as the change itself; and where the change is for the better, men are deeply solicitous that there should be no relapse. But the apostle blesses God that the one effective and irresistible precaution against the relapse has not been supplied by him! Of the theology of Mr. Mozley touching this matter we find no trace in the New Testament. If conversion be a change of heart and life, regeneration is also a change of heart and life; and if regeneration be a change to which perpetuity is imparted, so is conversion a change to which perpetuity is imparted. But of the impartation of this enduring quality to conversion in the ordinance of baptism we hear nothing in any inspired document whatever; and it has been so far from commending itself to the general belief of Sacramentarians, that they have by an overwhelming majority rejected it. There is therefore a double failure in the method of proof pursued by Mr. Mozley, for he has not only not established the essential difference between conversion and regeneration, but he has not proved the asserted communication in baptism of that special gift which exalts the alleged precarious quality of conversion into the immortal quality of regeneration.

Equally grave objections lie against another view of Mr. Mozley, that a man's regeneration is less under the control of his will than his conversion, and therefore more enduring. His words are, "He believes and repents before he is baptized; if he lives ever so long in the enjoyment of an *assisting* grace, ever so high after baptism, will he end with anything more

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

than with that with which he began, faith and repentance? Will he ever be perfect so long as he has only a grace which depends on his will for its effect? He cannot be" (p. 45).

Now the superiority which Mr. Mozley here accords to regeneration over conversion is that it does not depend on the will of man, which he excludes altogether from any agency in the matter, inasmuch as in the next sentence he expressly says, "The result, so long as it depends *at all* on himself, will be unsatisfactory." We venture to doubt the philosophical and the scriptural foundation of an opinion which thus absolutely debars the activity of the individual will. But waiving this, we are strongly persuaded that the distinction in question is wholly a theological conceit. How does it appear that conversion has more of will in it than regeneration? Conversion often comes to those who seek it not. It surprises them in the midst of their sinful career. The word of God, quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, pierces them under the ministry of the gospel, and pricks them in their heart, so that in an hour the whole current of their affections and purposes is reversed. We do not affirm that in this change there has been no energy, however feeble, of the will of man; but it is impossible to conceive a change that is not wholly mechanical in which the voluntary agency of man shall have less play. The man, however, though converted by repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, is still, we are told, in a position of vacillation and uncertainty, until rendered steadfast by the grace of regeneration which is conferred in baptism. But we are surprised that Mr. Mozley did not perceive that regeneration is far more dependent on the will than conversion (if his distinction may be for the moment allowed), for surely a man may determine whether he will be baptized or not, and tens of thousands among the Society of Friends do determine that they will not be baptized, and thus, according to Mr. Mozley, lack the grace that can establish their claim and perfect their qualification for eternal life.

The perseverance of the saints is one thing, the endowment of them with that indestructible element in baptism is another; and they are so far from being connected with each other by a necessity of thought, or in any other way, that in the Church

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

of England there are clergymen who believe in the indefeasibleness of Divine grace, but deny the efficacy of baptism ; and clergymen who maintain the efficacy of baptism, but deny the indefeasibleness of Divine grace.

With the views held by Mr. Mozley as to the perpetuity of the grace of regeneration bestowed in baptism, it will not surprise the reader to learn that he denies the uniform presence of that grace in baptism. Confronted with the moral aspects of society, and with the actual history of thousands, who, having been duly baptized become heretics in faith, and dissolute in life, and die in their sins, he has to reconcile these distressing phenomena with the theory that regeneration is imparted in baptism. His process is simple. It is that of denying that regeneration is a constant result of the sacrament. Baptism *must precede* regeneration,—this he holds to be the appointment of the evangelic economy. Regeneration *will follow* baptism,—this he renounces as an error. The connexion of the sacrament with the spiritual blessing is occasional and conditional,—so occasional, that it may not exist in one of a thousand instances of its administration ; and so conditional and obscure, that no mortal intelligence can detect when it really takes place.

Mr. Mozley, in terms of the most energetic character, repudiates the doctrine, which is all but universal among the High Sacramentarian party, that baptism secures in the case of all infants the remission of original sin. (p. 55) *No sin*, he maintains, is forgiven in the case of any to whom *all* sins are not forgiven ; and instead of its being true in fact, as the letter of the Baptismal Service and Catechism most unambiguously proclaims, that every baptized child has received the remission of sins, the assurance proceeds upon a condition, and the condition is the individual's future life and conduct. (p. 56) If these be godly, then the godliness reacts, as it were, backwards upon the baptismal sacrament, and imparts to it a regenerative and saving nature ; if these be ungodly, the reaction disastrously deprives the sacrament of all its salutary properties, and leaves the man under the final wrath of God. It would seem to follow inevitably from this representation that the baptismal grace, as it is termed, is no baptismal grace at all, and that the

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

determining element of a man's salvation is what takes place subsequently to baptism. If it were the purpose of the compilers of the Prayer Book and Catechism to teach this truth, their conceptions of the force and meaning of language must have been strangely obscure and confused. Indeed, if Mr. Mozley's interpretation be right, nothing short of a miraculous blindness extending to the whole conclave could account for their use of forms which seem to convey a doctrine exactly the reverse of what it was their assumed purpose to teach. For how stands the case? The office of baptism nowhere intimates that a service is about to be performed the efficacy of which will depend on something to be done hereafter. It assumes and asserts, in words clear as sunbeams, that a blessing is then and thereby about to be imparted, whatever may be the future life of the candidate for baptism. That future life may be, or may not be, answerable to the grace conveyed in the sacrament. The service, in fact, assumes the possibility of either alternative, for it prays that the end may be in accordance with the beginning. It asserts the *reality* of the beginning. Conditionality upon this point is expressly shut out. Uncertainty pertains solely to the character of the subsequent life, and is neither said nor supposed to affect the validity and reality of the baptismal grace. The thanksgiving declares that "it hath pleased the most merciful Father to regenerate this infant with His Holy Spirit, and to receive him as His own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into His holy Church." The regeneration is actual, and not suspended on any future conduct of the candidate. One thing is secured beyond the reach of doubt, and that is a beginning. But this would not be secured if regeneration were a supposition, a thing floating in a sea of uncertainties until the close of the child's earthly life. The exhortation, "Let us with one accord make our prayers unto Him that this child may lead the rest of his life according to this beginning," does not assuredly mean that this child may lead the rest of his life so as to render this a good beginning. The theory of Mr. Mozley embodies the absurdity of the supposition that when we desire that a runner may continue his race as well as he begins it, we mean that he has not started at all unless he wins the crown.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

The reader may be concerned to know in what manner Mr. Mozley reconciles his view that regeneration is confined to the elect with the teaching of the Baptismal Offices and the Catechism, which assert that all who are baptized are, in their baptism, made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. The bridge which spans what seems to be an impassable gulf he designates "the Rule of Supposition." This he sets up, not as an expedient, but as a principle, which he vindicates with a rare ability. The elaborate chapter in which he does battle for this method of solution is by far the best defence in our language of a theory which we are convinced is indefensible. Mr. Goode, in his famous work on the Effects of Infant Baptism, while espousing substantially the same method of reconciliation, seems to feel that it suits but awkwardly some expressions in the Catechism, of which he confesses "his own view would, even in theory, apart from the experience of the results, be adverse to the use of such language."* And another, who was once a distinguished ornament of the Church of England, was constrained to secede, among other considerations, by the straits to which he felt himself reduced in seeking to reconcile his convictions with the language of the Prayer Book. "I once laboured hard," says Mr. Baptist Noel, "to convince myself that our Reformers did not and could not mean that infants are regenerated by baptism; but no reasoning avails. This language is too plain. The Prayer Book assumes clearly that both adults and infants come to the font unregenerate, and leave it regenerate; that worthy recipients are not regenerated before baptism, but come to be regenerated; that they are unpardoned up to the moment of baptism, that they are pardoned the moment after."†

Mr. Mozley, however, is not staggered by this positive and unconditional language, for a broad yet silent hypothesis explains the whole. This rule of supposition he holds to be almost universal, both in common life and in Scripture. Men about whom we know nothing are supposed to be good until we find them to be bad. The Jewish people were described as God's servants whom He had chosen, though among them there

* On the Effects of Infant Baptism, p. 469.

† Essay on Church and State, p. 419.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

were multitudes that were sunk in unfaithfulness and corruption. By a high supposition the whole people were depicted as being, in fact and constantly, what they were only occasionally or in part. The singular faith and holiness of some are hypothetically imputed to the whole. In like manner, in the New Testament the apostles write to the churches in language which presumes them to be bodies of sanctified men, elect, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ; and these glorious designations are bestowed upon communities which, so far from literally deserving them, and embodying those qualities of character and life which they are supposed to include, were composed of individuals all of whom were manifestly immature, and some of whom were marked by grave violations of Christian purity and truth. But these notorious defects and inconsistencies did not induce the apostles to qualify the full and glowing appellations by which they were described. They regarded the churches by a "high supposition" as being what they professed to be, and what they ought to be. The apostles had in their minds a perfect ideal of the Christian man in a state of consummated sanctification, when through the grace of Christ he should be without spot or wrinkle, and they viewed the churches in the light of this lofty conception. With many of Mr. Mozley's observations on this matter we fully agree, but they signally fail either, on the one hand, to defend the specific and absolute language of the Baptismal Service and the Catechism, or, on the other, to reconcile with it the position of the Author, which in many cases, and possibly in most, divorces baptism from regeneration. The apostles wrote to professed believers, who, with all their ignorance and imperfections and inconsistencies, were in the main viewed as true followers of Christ. The general expressions of the apostles were justified by their application to general communities. The inhabitants of one nation are spoken of as grave, though there are many who are mercurial and giddy; and the inhabitants of another as frivolous, though there are thousands that are earnest and sober-minded. An audience is addressed as intelligent without any special exception being signalized of a score of uninstructed men; and a large family may be characterized as handsome without note being taken of

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

one that is ill-favoured. But do these and similar facts supply any just analogy in favour of a service which applies its words to each individual case, and which pronounces regenerate, not a mass, but every separate person in the mass? The Baptismal Service does not treat of the Church in general. It treats of that single infant that may be present at the font, and of him only. The exhortation is concerning him—the declaration is about him—the thanksgiving has exclusive relation to him, and throughout the whole service there is not only not a word of “high supposition,” but those who bring the child are besought not “to doubt, but earnestly to believe that Christ will favourably receive *this present infant*; that He will embrace him with the arms of His mercy, that He will give him the blessing of eternal life, and make him partaker of His everlasting kingdom.” That such words can be employed by men who believe that in every case a child receives regenerative grace in the shape of a germ which, if duly fostered, will bloom with immortal life, we can well understand; but that they should be employed by men who affirm that regeneration does not, of necessity, accompany baptism, that it is given to elect children alone, and that consequently it may *not* be given to one out of a thousand, we confess is a circumstance that wholly baffles us.

Mr. Mozley devotes his last chapter to the subject, “The Regeneration of Infants,” upon which we purpose to offer a few observations. Into the general question of the scripturalness of the baptism of infants we cannot enter without departing from the purpose we have had in view in this tractate. We therefore simply express our conviction, held with all deference to the counter-opinions of many learned and godly men, both living and dead, that the baptism of infants has ample warrant in the comprehensive commission of our Lord to His disciples, “Go ye, and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you,” to say nothing of other passages in the New Testament. We believe that the discipling was to be accomplished by baptism and by teaching, the baptism being the rite of initiation, as well as the emblem of that spiritual cleansing which the teaching,

under the blessing of the Holy Spirit, was designed to produce. But if we held the same views as Mr. Mozley on the necessary conditions of baptism, we should be compelled to relinquish the defence which he institutes for infant baptism as practised in the Church of England. "Repentance and faith," he says, "are plainly laid down in Scripture as the necessary condition of baptism. Adults can in themselves fulfil these conditions, and therefore adults can be in themselves fit subjects of baptism. But infants cannot in themselves fulfil these conditions, and are not in themselves fit subjects for baptism."—P. 127.

Granting, which however we do not, the assumption on which his reasoning proceeds, that repentance and faith are plainly laid down in Scripture as the necessary conditions of baptism, we deny the inference that therefore infants unable to fulfil these conditions are not fit subjects in themselves for baptism. The necessary conditions of which Mr. Mozley speaks can be, at the best, necessary conditions for those to whom they are possible, and whose previous life has been of a nature to require them. A child may be entitled to the reception, without conditions, of a benefit which is accessible to adults, only on conditions. It may be a true maxim in the case of adults that "he that will not work, neither shall he eat," but infants are entitled to food, not in spite of the maxim, but because it is wholly inapplicable to them. The language of Mr. Mozley does not elucidate the question, but obscures it, for the point which he has in reality to determine is whether or not infants according to the Christian dispensation require baptism and are entitled to it. If they neither require it nor are entitled to it, then it should not be administered. If they do require it, and are entitled to it, it is surely obvious that no conditions can be expected from them which they are unable to fulfil, and that they are, in themselves, therefore fit subjects for baptism. If they do not repent, it is sufficient that as yet they have nothing to repent of; if they do not believe, it is sufficient that as yet He upon whom the faith of adults can be exercised has not been revealed to them. If Mr. Mozley assume that baptism is for those only who having sinned can repent, and having heard of a Saviour can believe, the course proper to his argument and practical conduct is to relinquish

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

the administration of baptism to infants. Instead of this, however, he lays down a canon which, interpreted literally, excludes infants from the rite; and then in an indirect and circuitous manner, on the principle of a vicarious sponsorship, gives them admission to it. "They are made fit," he says, "by the faith and repentance of other persons being accepted as a substitute for their own, that is, by allowing other persons to stand in their place as far as these conditions are concerned, and expressly accounting and regarding them so far as if they were those other persons."—P. 127.

Upon this expedient for securing to infants a *locus standi* as candidates for baptism, in consistency with his theory, we submit the following remarks.

In the first place, Mr. Mozley's expedient violates his own principle. His principle was that faith and repentance were required in the subjects of baptism. The sponsors are not the actual subjects of baptism, and may have neither faith nor repentance, and whether they are *reasonably* presumed to possess these graces let any parish priest in England declare. The sponsors are not baptized for the infant, even though they were supposed to be the subjects of faith and repentance; so that, so far from Mr. Mozley administering baptism to those who have the qualifications, he administers it to those who have them not.

In the next place, we observe that the sponsorship which Mr. Mozley, in common with his Church, defends, is without the shadow of foundation in Scripture. It is not even a Jewish custom, but was, in all probability, imported into the Christian Church from a heathen source, and involves such a substitution of soul for soul, and such a transference of moral obligations, that it is difficult to conceive how any man who seriously considers the matter can imagine it possible to fulfil the engagements which sponsorship solemnly accepts.

Further, it is firmly declared by many of the ablest writers in the Church of England that the faith and repentance either of sponsors or of parents affect in nowise the validity or efficacy of infant baptism, and that though necessary for the public completeness of the baptismal ceremony, they are unnecessary for the impartation of the baptismal grace. The present Bishop of Ely, Dr. Harold Browne, in his exposition of the Thirty-nine

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

Articles, is so strong in his opposition to the doctrine that such vicarious piety is assumed in justification of the rite of infant baptism, that he says, "The theory that the faith of parents or sponsors is necessary to give effect to baptism in infants is *not to be maintained for an instant*. This were to cross the whole principle of evangelical mercy. It would be to make the child's salvation hinge on its parents' faithfulness. It would make God's grace contingent not even on the merits of the recipient, but actually on the merits of the recipient's friends. Sponsors, after all, are probably of human institution, and cannot therefore affect a Divine ordinance. And this theory does sadly derogate from the grace of God, which acts ever freely and spontaneously; and grievously magnifies the office of human faith, which is, humbly to receive mercy, not arrogantly to deserve it."—P. 619.

This view of the Bishop is abundantly supported by the fact that in the private baptism of infants, when no god-parents are present, thanksgiving is offered to God that it hath pleased Him "to regenerate this infant with His Holy Spirit;" and that no uncertainty may be supposed to attach to the validity and efficacy of baptism, the Rubric which follows says, "Let them not doubt but that the child so baptized is lawfully and sufficiently baptized, and ought not to be baptized again; but nevertheless if the child which is after this sort baptized do afterward live, it is expedient that it be brought into the church to the intent that, if the minister of the same parish did himself baptize the child, the congregation may be certified of the true form of baptism by him privately before used." Whatever sponsorship, therefore, may include in the shape of Christian character and duty to be cultivated and exhibited after the child is baptized and regenerated, it brings no element of efficacy whatsoever to the sacrament itself. And if Mr. Mozley vindicates infant baptism on the ground that the faith and repentance which infants have not, are possessed by their sponsors, we hold that his theory is philosophically impossible, theologically unscriptural, and ecclesiastically disallowed by the baptismal offices of his own Church. Of all the theories of Baptismal Regeneration we have met with, the one we have just reviewed invests the condition of infants with the most

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

thick and hopeless gloom. It starts with the declaration that regeneration is real and actual goodness as distinct from capacity for it, and that it is a final goodness as distinguished from goodness for the time being; it affirms that in the case of adults it must be preceded by faith and repentance, or conversion of heart and life, to which perpetuity is given in the sacrament of baptism; and that in the case of infants they are unfit subjects for baptism, and therefore for regeneration, except on the ground of the faith and repentance of their sponsors; and then we have the unmistakable teaching of the Church that sponsors, whether good or bad, are unessential to the sacrament as such, and to the regeneration which it conveys.* Mr. Mozley denies to infants any *inherent* fitness for baptism; and the Church pronounces them regenerated irrespective of any substituted worthiness on the part of others. With him, sponsorial faith and repentance are indispensable to the regeneration; with his Church, the suretyship is an ecclesiastical provision, but not a spiritual necessity. In what manner the two views are to be harmonized, we are wholly unable to discover. The Bishop of Ely, so far from conceding the unfitness of children for baptism on the ground alleged by Mr. Mozley, that they are born in sin, confidently contends that the "very helplessness of children is their protection. We cannot too much remember that God's gifts come from Him, and not from us; from His mercy, not from our merits, our faith, or our obedience. The only obstacle which infants can offer to grace is the taint of original corruption. But to say that original sin is a bar to receiving remission of original sin (which is one chief grace of the sacrament) is a positive contradiction in terms."—*Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 619.

The Bishop, in common, we are persuaded, with the generality of the Fathers and of ecclesiastical writers down to the

* This matter is set at rest by the reply of the Bishops to the objection of the reforming party at the last revision of the Liturgy, in which, defending the phraseology of the answer in the Catechism to the question, "Why, then, are infants baptized?" they say that "the effect of children's baptism depends neither upon their present actual faith and repentance (which the Catechism says expressly they cannot perform), nor upon the faith and repentance of their natural parents or pro-parents, or of their godfathers or godmothers, but upon the ordinance and institution of Christ."—*Cardwell's Conferences*, p. 357.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

present day, maintains that in all cases original sin is forgiven in the baptism of children; but Mr. Mozley denies that it is forgiven in any case where the child is not elect, and therefore finally saved.

Further, we have been unable to discover in what manner Mr. Mozley can reconcile his belief in the salvation of all infants who die after baptism, but before the commission of actual sin, with his doctrine of sponsorial godliness, even though such a doctrine were admitted to be that of his Church. We believe, in fact, that he has destroyed the only bridge by which the conciliation was at all possible. He declares, in the first place, that infants are not in themselves fit subjects for baptism, and he assigns as a reason for this unfitness that they are incapable in their own persons of the essential qualifications for baptism, namely, faith and repentance. He declares, in the next place, that their unfitness is met and cancelled by the fitness of substitutes, in the shape of sponsors, who supply the lacking conditions. He declares, in the third place, that all children who are baptized and die before positive transgression, are, without doubt, saved. But it is strange that Mr. Mozley did not see that the faith and repentance of sponsors can be at the best but *hypothetical*, and that therefore the salvation of the infants whose only fitness for baptism is supplied by their sponsors can never, on his own principles, attain to certainty. If the fitness of children be derived from the fitness of sponsors, the former can never be more indubitable than the latter, and Mr. Mozley cannot mean to affirm that he has never known of instances in which baptized infants have died whose sponsors have been dissolute and ungodly men. What will he say of these infants who had no fitness of their own, and none supplied by their substitutes? If they are saved, it must be by a grace wholly distinct from baptism, or which is intercepted by no unfitness either of their own or their sponsors. And if the unfitness of the sponsors do not arrest this grace, his whole substitutional theory falls to the ground.

Before closing this examination of the theory of Mr. Mozley, which, with slight differences, is also that of Mr. Goode and Mr. Gorham, we are constrained to make one or two observations on the part which "original sin" has been made to play

in the history of Baptismal Regeneration, especially from the time of Augustine to our own day. "The first foundation and groundwork of the doctrine of Baptism," says Mr. Keble, "and that on which all the rest of it depends, is the doctrine of original sin" (p. 28). And this sin is held to be, not simply a weakness of nature, a privation, a taint, an inherited incapacity, but guilt for which the child is declared to be punishable. There is not one term applicable to active, conscious, purposed criminality, which the great luminary of the African Church does not apply indiscriminately to the "original sin" of the new-born infant. It is "culpa," "vitium," "delictum," "peccatum," "reatus." How far the severity of his opinions and language arose from the natural ardour of his temperament, and from the exasperating influence of his controversy with Pelagius, it is difficult to say, but his treatise* on original sin is marked by a grim consistency of reasoning which makes us wonder how the humanity of the saint could survive the conclusions of the logician. Throughout the whole of his treatise there are no signs of "compunctious visitings" at the revolting conclusions to which his premises inexorably led. Having assumed the actual criminality of the infant before, as yet, the very conception of sin, or aught else, was possible, he pronounced it a victim of damnation. On many other questions he is inconsistent with himself; on this, at least, he is ever the same. "Little children," he says, "who are not incorporated by baptism with the body and members of Christ, pertain to damnation" (x. 290 A. "De peccat. merit"). "They remain in perdition and darkness" (x. 219 A., *id.*) "The wrath of God remaineth on them" (x. 288 A., *id.*) "They undergo the punishment of the second death" (x. 822 C., *id.*) "They are sent into eternal fire" (v. 1741). "They are under the power of the devil" (x. 672). Even the infants that are inadvertently "suffocated by their sleeping mother" share the same everlasting perdition (v. 204); and Augustine bows his head before the mystery, and exclaims, "O the depth of the riches!" And further he declares that the whole Church of Christ with one consent holds the perdition of unbaptized infants.

A doctrine from which such appalling conclusions can be

* Augustine Opera. x. "De peccatorum meritis et remissione."

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

legitimately drawn behoves to be established on the surest foundations, and no foundation short of a revelation accredited by the most incontestable signs will be sufficient to lodge in our minds a conviction which calls upon us to relinquish the elemental principles both of reasoning and of moral truth. "Original guilt" in an infant incapable of thought is not a mystery, but a contradiction, and the forgiveness of such guilt in baptism is a monstrous absurdity, which, as it is destitute of scriptural warrant, we decline to accept even at the hands of the Bishop of Hippo, who accounts himself as only the representative on this matter of the opinion of the universal Church. If he were correct in this assumption (which we more than doubt), what must be our estimate of the compassionate charity of that Church which, departing glaringly from apostolic practice, restricted baptism for the most part to Easter and Whitsuntide, and the interval (as some allege) between the two. In cases of necessity, we are told, the sacrament might be administered at any other time, but what can be meant by cases of necessity in a world like ours, in which all life is precarious, and infant life especially so, and in which to die without the *viaticum* of baptism is to be sealed to perdition. When the blessing to be bestowed, and the doom to be escaped, are so unutterable, and when the conditions of life are so frail at the best, and so incalculable as well as frail, and where the administration of a sacrament makes all the difference between being constituted an heir of the kingdom of Heaven, or being left an heir of Hell, we might have deemed the case of necessity to be the universal and the only case. Such, however, was not the opinion of the Church in the time of Augustine, and for nearly two centuries before him. The salvation of children, moreover, sustained additional jeopardy from the introduction of the system of catechumenism as a preparation for baptism, as it involved the postponement of a saving ordinance. If there be in infants *guilt* which must be forgiven in baptism, or they are lost without hope, the spiritual birth should be made as coinstantaneous as possible with the birth "of the flesh," so as to preclude at once all hazards arising from an early death. If the Fathers had insisted on this practice, baptizing children,

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

as the Jews circumcised them, on the eighth day, or even earlier still, their doctrine of regeneration would have been consistently supported and enforced. As it was, their faith went one way, and their practice another. Of all the Fathers, Augustine, as the most strenuous maintainer of original guilt, might have been expected to advocate this early baptism, for, in contradiction to the rest of the Fathers, he held that the circumcision which baptism displaced was itself a saving ordinance. As this has been doubted, we submit the following citations from his works. "That circumcision on the eighth day carried the figure of the resurrection day of the Saviour, and also the grace of baptism" (x. 2250 B). "Assuredly the ancient people of God regarded circumcision in the place of baptism" (ix. 423). "Answer me this, if you can, why if Isaac himself had not been circumcised on the eighth day with the sign of the baptism of Christ, his soul would have perished from amongst the people" (x. 1016 B). And by the perishing of the soul he distinctly declares that he does not mean temporal death alone. Now whether Augustine's interpretation of the awful consequences of neglected circumcision be true or not (and of its erroneousness we are confident), and however in other places he speaks of circumcision as a sign, or figure, or shadow of baptism, it is clear that he considered it as the saving sacrament under the ancient dispensation, and baptism under the new. And yet even Augustine, with all his revolting conceptions of the final perdition of unbaptized children, and with his identification of circumcision with baptism, on this point, at least, that they both availed to remove original sin, did not extend to the children of the new dispensation the merciful deliverance secured, under express command, to Jewish children, but acquiesced in the practice which, without any apostolic authority, restricted baptism to certain seasons, and thus multiplied the perils of everlasting ruin to all the children under his care.

What was the final and matured opinion of Augustine respecting the spiritual efficacy of baptism is not so clear as Dr. Pusey would seem to represent. Speaking of a sacrament in general, he says that "a sacrament is one thing, but the virtue of the sacrament is another." "How many receive at the altar

and die—yes, die by receiving?”* Again: “Now the faith that then was concealed, being revealed to all who are baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the laver of regeneration is common, . . . but the grace is not common to all.”† Again: “The visible baptism was of no service to Simon Magus, who lacked the invisible sanctification.”‡ Sometimes it would appear as if baptism were little more than the incorporation of the subject into the Church of Christ; sometimes as if it were the impartation of the highest and most spiritual blessings, as when he says that “children are washed by the sacrament and the charity of the faithful, and so incorporated with the body of Christ, which is His Church, that they may be reconciled to God, and that they may be in Him alive, safe, free, redeemed, and illuminated.”§ Sometimes it seems to confer a grace which is perishable, as when he speaks of “those who once were in the practice of goodness, but because they remained not in it, that is, did not persevere to the end, they were not in the number of sons, even when they were in the faith of sons;” and at other times it seems to confer a grace which is imperishable, as in all infants dying after baptism, and in all the predestinated.¶ When Dr. Pusey says that Augustine’s theory of predestination did not involve the doctrine of the indefectibility of grace, he has failed to recognize that Augustine maintains the absolute indestructibility of that special grace which is given in baptism to *the elect*. A final proof of the impossibility of eliciting from the writings of Augustine a harmonious doctrine on the subject of baptism is supplied by the fact that after having affirmed in numberless instances, directly and indirectly, the doctrine that baptism secures eternal life, he invalidates the salvation even of baptized infants dying in infancy, by declaring that the participation of the Lord’s Supper is an indispensable necessity to eternal life; so that while children who die unbaptized perish without doubt, remedy, or hope, children who die before partaking of the

* Vol. iii., 1983 B.

‡ Vol. iii., 815 D.

† Vol. iv., 1166 D.

§ Vol. x., c.

¶ Indeed in one passage he restricts Baptismal Regeneration to the elect, saying that “Christ draws to the justification of eternal life all who being predestinated are by baptism regenerated.”—Vol. x., 273 D.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

communion "likewise perish." Lest a dogma so startling should seem to be imputed to Augustine without, or on inadequate grounds, we at once append the evidence. "Whence," says he, "unless from ancient, and I opine from apostolic tradition" (a common phrase with the Fathers when they are seeking inspired paternity for the most monstrous births), "have the Churches of Christ held that, apart from Baptism and the Lord's Supper, no one can attain, not only the kingdom of God, but even salvation and eternal life."*

"Behold, Innocent the Pope, of blessed memory, saith that without the baptism of Christ, and without the participation of the body and blood of Christ, little children have not life."†

After some years of patient effort to find in the great African Father a consistent doctrine on the nature and effects of baptism, we have relinquished the task in despair, and we are convinced that he can be cited on this question with equal fairness and cogency by the most opposite theological schools. Dr. Pusey evidently finds him the most unmanageable of all the Fathers, and yet he can press him into service as a deponent to High Sacramentarianism. That he is as prompt and valid a witness for an opposite dogma, we have already seen. What is the worth of his testimony on either side, when it can be pleaded indifferently on both, we leave the reader to judge.

The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, in the sense which makes the sacrament one which operates inward and spiritual changes, has certainly to encounter strong antecedent improbabilities arising both from reason and revelation. What connexion God Himself can establish between an external rite and an internal and everlasting renewal, it is not, we confess, for man to say. When an appeal is made to the Divine omnipotence, we acknowledge that to its resources nothing is impossible which does not violate either the essential distinctions of morality, or the essential principles of reasoning. The conversion of falsehood into truth, or the making of the same thing to be and not to be at the same moment, is a performance beyond the power of omnipotence itself. The former would be the annihilation of all ethical reality, and the latter would make thought itself to be an illusion. Within these

* Vol. x., 214 A.

† Vol. x., 830 B.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

limits, which could not be transcended without the instantaneous abolition of that common ground which renders possible any communication between the Creator and His intelligent and moral creatures, any miracle is possible which may commend itself to infinite wisdom and goodness, and we are prepared to accept it, with all its mystery, if the evidence which avouches it be sufficient. To accept it without such evidence would be for reason to abdicate her functions, and under the guise of devotion to sink into abject superstition. And when we have observed the extent to which, in connexion with all religions, human faith has been abused by the monstrous tenets it has been led to accept, and the debasing practices which it has been induced to perform, it surely is a matter of pressing concern to rescue it from its perversion and bondage, and to see that its ear and its obedience are reserved for the voice of God alone. Faith in the mysteries which are inherent in things, and are, therefore, divine, exalts us, through the reverence and humility which it creates; but faith in the mysteries of a thaumaturgic sacerdotalism inflicts on the soul a manifold disaster. It subjects it to the dominion of a lie. It circumscribes the liberty, and thereby cramps the healthy development of the intellect. It places one man under the ghostly dominion of his fellow-man. It unnerves the soul by fictitious perils, or settles it in as fictitious a security; and, as the tendency of an abuse is ever to encroach upon a rightful use, a true faith yields its ground more and more to a blind credulity.

When we consider all the elements which go to constitute that stupendous change which in Scripture is denominated the "new birth," we are certainly not prepared to expect that they are the *opus operatum* of an external sacrament. Man is not in mere ceremonial alienation from God, or a ceremonial might effect the reconciliation. The mind is carnal, and the carnality is an enmity of will and affection. The ravages of sin have spread themselves through the whole region of the soul. The love of God has been displaced by the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life. And all this derangement of both relation and character has to be repaired, so that from being enemies of God we shall become His sons, having His love shed abroad in the heart, being renewed in the spirit of our

mind. Now a change so transcendent, glorious, and complete might naturally be expected to be produced in connexion with the exercise of those endowments of mind and heart by which man has been distinguished from the beasts that perish, and made capable of holding intelligent and loving communion with God. That divine adaptation of means to ends which we discover in every other region of God's operations, and to which we are in the habit of appealing in proof of His existence and wisdom, we should naturally look for in this new kingdom of His grace. He who has provided bread for hunger, water for thirst, light for the eye, sound for the ear, truth for the intelligence, right for the conscience, and love for the heart, will surely reveal in His great restorative scheme the same congruity of means and ends. But the effectuation of high moral and spiritual results through means of a ceremony which is outward and physical, would be an achievement wholly without parallel in any other department of the Divine workings. That a soul should be pardoned, cleansed, renovated by an outward baptism of which at the time it is wholly unconscious, is a dogma so extraordinary, that nothing can commend it to our faith but "confirmations strong as holy writ." The erection of a temple by repeating a series of syllogisms before a mass of stones, timber, and iron; or the chasing away of a mortal fever by a strain of music; or the enkindling of the light of genius in the rudimental mind of an imbecile by waving over his head a rod, would be marvels even less astounding than that which, in the language of Dr. Pusey, makes baptism the instrument of regeneration.

The antecedent improbabilities of such a connexion between baptism and a spiritual birth are so numerous and grave, arising both from the nature of man himself, and of the water to which regenerative efficacy is imputed, that the authority of Fathers and councils would of itself not weigh one feather in the scale against them. Indeed, in the view of the follies and contradictions which such authority has so frequently shielded, it would only supply an additional ground of suspicion against any dogma which it undertook to accredit, especially if it were one which exalted the office and functions of the priesthood.

This *à priori* unlikelihood of the truth of sacramental

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

efficacy is strengthened by an appeal to the old dispensation, in which, if anywhere, a saving ritual might have been expected. It was an economy of priests and sacerdotal services, and yet there was not one ceremony with the outward observance of which any salutary virtue was inseparably associated. Circumcision, so far as concerned its operation on the soul, profited as little as uncircumcision, in spite of the solitary disclaimer of Augustine, whose opinion on this matter is equally at issue with that of all the Fathers, and of him who is superior to them all, the great apostle to the Gentiles. Circumcision might make a man "outwardly" a Jew, but a godly man it could not make him. It were strange, therefore, if, in an economy purposely and predominantly ceremonial, there were no saving rite, and if in that economy which is one of spirit and of truth, and in which all priesthood, save that of Christ Himself, is expressly abolished, salvation should have been made conditional on an exterior ceremony. That there has been no such inversion and regression in the revelation and appointments of God we have seen in the course of this essay.

And the test of experience comes in finally to confirm the whole. For where are the effects of that spiritual regeneration which baptism is alleged to convey? Are they realized and discriminated in the consciousness of the individual himself in the moment of baptism? Is there any adult who is prepared to affirm that from the instant of his baptism he is sensible of a positive acquisition of new light, and power, and sanctity? Can we, with any approximation to truth, select from the population of our country those who have been thus regenerated, being guided in our selection by their observed superiority of character? Are they more honest, more virtuous, more pure, more devout, more generous than others? Is there any conspicuous mitigation in the quality of natural depravity in those who have been baptismally renewed, and that too in consequence of their baptismal grace? Is there any teacher who can pronounce at once and with certainty from the behaviour of the children committed to his care, which of them are regenerated, and which are not? Could any one, on the same principle, distinguish the felons in a prison, or the workmen in a manufactory? The man must be invincibly obstinate in his

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

adhesion to a favourite theory who can maintain that the effects of baptism are such as thus to challenge and command our recognition. And we shrink not from the statement that the moral condition of our own country, including the hundreds of thousands who have been regenerated by baptism, is such as to evince the baselessness of any pretence which connects moral and spiritual results with the administration of this ordinance. This appeal to results we are justified in making, not simply on the ground of the inductive philosophy, but because our Lord has bidden us to test both men and doctrines by their fruits. If it be said that the reason why Baptismal Regeneration is not more palpably effective is to be found in the widespread neglect to cultivate the baptismal grace, we are constrained to reply that the grace here spoken of is an assumption which has not yet been established, and that a grace is inconceivable, which, while possessing all the properties which Dr. Pusey ascribes to this, does not stimulate and incite to its own culture and preservation. An internal grace which neither impels to holiness nor restrains from sin, which is neither matter of consciousness as a principle, nor of observation as an active and fruitful energy, is a phantom created by a theology which has substituted for a "reasonable service" the "opus operatum" of priestcraft. And as we cannot but regard with undissembled sorrow and apprehension the diffusion of such a theology in our country as a retrogression towards that darkness and bondage from which the Reformation delivered us, we have endeavoured to examine the grounds upon which the reaction is professedly based, convinced that while baptism, like circumcision, is a divine ordinance, it is true of both, and of both equally, that in themselves they "avail nothing—but a new creature."

THE INCARNATION.

Παρανοῦμεν δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅπερ καὶ ἑαυτοῖς παρανοοῖεν, τὴν παραδοθεῖσαν πιστὴν φυλάττειν, ἐκτρέπεσθαι δὲ τὰς βεβήλους καυοφωνίας.—ATHANAS. *De Incarnatione Verbi.*

“WILL GOD INDEED DWELL ON THE EARTH?”* When Solomon uttered this exclamation at the dedication of the Temple, he had in all probability nothing before his mind beyond such a presence of God with men as it had been always the privilege of the chosen people to enjoy, in fulfilment of God’s own gracious assurance when He gave command to erect the Tabernacle, that He would “dwell among the children of Israel and be their God.”† God was amongst His people as the present object of their worship, as the hearer of their prayer, as the source of constant blessing to them, the King and Judge of Israel, a very present help in every time of trouble. That He whom “the heaven of heavens cannot contain” should thus condescend to dwell on the earth, seemed to the pious monarch so marvellous, that with adoring gratitude he asks could such a thing be.

But the question of Solomon, taken by itself, may bear a deeper significancy, and may be understood as pointing to something infinitely more marvellous than that manifestation of God which he anticipated. The history of man’s efforts after a religion amply shows that a dwelling of God, not in spirit and agency merely, but actually and hypostatically with man, is an object of conscious and trembling desire to

* 1 Kings viii. 27.

† Exod. xxix. 45.

THE INCARNATION.

man. All mythologies, both oriental and occidental, show traces of man's quest after this. A union of some sort of the human and the divine man seeks after, though with mingled hope and dread, as a felt necessity of his soul. Sometimes by supposing God to be the Soul of the universe dwelling in man as in the material world; sometimes by filling heaven with deities possessed of bodies, and having passions little different from our own; sometimes by imagining actual descents of the Deity in human form; and sometimes by celebrating the rise of great heroes and eminent men by an apotheosis into gods; the heathen have tried to alleviate the difficulty which man must ever feel in seeking how he may have intercourse with the Deity. From the facts thus presented to us it does not seem too much to infer that an incarnation of the Divine Being is an hypothesis not foreign to our intelligence; nay, that this is felt by the human consciousness to be essential to religion. "The idea of the God-man," as Dörner remarks, "is not an idea which belongs only to this or that religion; rather is the germ of it found in all religions, just because they are religions;"* and the realization of this idea in actual fact is what man, as a religious being, has in all ages and everywhere been seeking.

What men have thus been in quest of, but have never been able of themselves to reach, Christianity presents to us in Jesus Christ. According to the universal belief of the Church from the earliest times, there were united in His person the divine nature and the human, both in absolute perfection, the human not limiting or obscuring the divine, the divine not absorbing or overwhelming the human. In His manifestation there was not a mere Theophany, such as was vouchsafed on special occasions under the earlier dispensations; nor was there a mere indwelling of Deity in Him such as was enjoyed by the prophets when they were God-inspired† and when rapt by the Holy Spirit they spoke;‡ nor was there anything of the nature of an apotheosis or lifting up of the man into the state and honour of a god. There was here a true and proper *ἐνσάρκωσις*, or *Incarnation*, a dwelling of God in human flesh,

* *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, i. 1.

† Θεὸς νεῖστοι.

‡ ὅτι ὁ Πνεύματος ἁγίου φερομένοι ἐλάλησαν.—2 Peter i. 21.

THE INCARNATION.

so that in Jesus Christ, in whose person this took place, there was, as some of the Fathers phrase it, an *ἐνανθρώπησις*,* a dwelling of God with man, and His appearance on earth was, as they describe it, *ἐνσαρκος παρουσία*, a presence or advent (*i. e.* of God) in flesh.† In the belief of this the Church worships Him as very God as well as very man.

I.

That this is the common belief of the Church it is unnecessary to stop to prove; we need only to refer to the creeds of the Churches for evidence sufficient of this. It may, however, be not altogether without advantage to show by the citation of a few passages, not from the formal utterances of the Church in her creeds, but from the writings of some of the early Fathers, how deeply this belief lay fixed in the heart of the Church, and how largely it influenced the life and thought of the Church even in the first ages of her existence.

IGNATIUS.—There is one Physician, both fleshly and spiritual, made and not made, God come in flesh, immortal in true life ‡ both of Mary and of God, first capable of suffering, then impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord.—*Ep. ad Ephes.*, ch. 7.

That I may suffer with Him, I endure all things, He strengthening me who became perfect man.—*Ep. ad Smyrn.*, ch. 4 (ed. Dressel, Lips., 1857).

JUSTIN MARTYR.—Jesus Christ, who was the Word and first-born and power of God, became His only Son properly so called, and by His will having become man He taught us these things for the restoration and restitution of the human race.—*Apol.* I., ch. 23; see also ch. 63; *Apol.* II., ch. 6 (ed. Otto, Jen., 1847).

IRENÆUS.—Potent Word and Very Man, redeeming us by His blood, He gave Himself a ransom for those who were led captive.—*Adv. Haer.*, v. 1.

* See Suicer, *Thesaur.*, *in voce*.

† Epiphanius, *Haeres.* I., p. 26. Athanasius, *Opp.*, pp. 249, 250, and often.

‡ *ἀθάνατος ἐν ζωῇ ἀληθινῇ*, ed. Dressel. There is another reading adopted by several editors, *ἐν θανάτῳ ζωῇ ἀληθινῇ*, but this, as Dressel says, "sermonis progressum turbat et male diffindit." *Patrum Apost. Opp.*, p. 126. The passage does not appear in the Syriac version edited by Cureton.

THE INCARNATION.

It is manifest, since He was the Word of God, who had become the Son of Man, receiving power from the Father to remit sins, inasmuch as He is man and God, that as man He sympathizes with us, as God He pities us, and remits the debts we owe to God who made us.—*Ibid.*, ch. 15 (ed. Grabe, Oxon, 1702).

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.—This Logos, the Christ, this very Logos who alone is both God and man, is the author to us of all good,—of being, for He was in God; of well-being, for now hath He appeared to men.—*Protrept.*, i. 7 (ed. Klotz.), p. 3 (ed. Sylburg).

Believe, O man, Him who is God and man; believe, O man, Him who suffered and is worshipped as living God; ye slaves, believe Him who was dead; all men, believe Him who alone is the God of all men.—*Ibid.*, x. 106; p. 30 (ed. Sylburg).

Now, O ye children, our Instructor is like unto God His Father, of whom He is the sinless, stainless, in-soul-unsuffering * Son, God undefiled in the form of man, servant of the Father's will, God the Logos, who is in the Father, who is at the right hand of the Father, and along with the form † [of man] God.—*Paedagog.*, i. 2, p. 35 (ed. Sylburg).

TERTULLIAN.—The Apostle teaches thus concerning each substance in Him. Who was made, says he, of the seed of David: This will be man, and the Son of man, who is determined to be the Son of God according to the Spirit. He will be God and Word, the Son of God. We see a double state, not confused, but conjoined in one person, God and the Man Jesus.—*Adv. Praxean*, ch. 27 (ed. Leopold, vol. iv., p. 286).

Thou canst not say, If He had been born, and put on very man, He would have ceased to be God, losing what He was in assuming what He was not. For to God there is no hazard of His status. But you say, I deny that God was really turned into man, so as to be born and to work in the flesh, because He who is without end is of necessity also inconvertible; for to be converted into another is the ending of the pristine state; so that conversion is not competent to Him to whom there can be no end. Now undoubtedly the nature of convertibles is subject to that law that they cannot continue in that which

* ἀπαθὴς τὴν ψυχὴν.

† σὺν τῷ σχήματι Θεοῦ.

THE INCARNATION.

is converted in them, and so by not continuing must perish, since they lose by conversion what they were. But nothing is on a par with God; His nature is far off from the condition of all things. If therefore things which are far off from God, or from which He is far off, when they are converted lose what they were, where would be the difference of the Divinity from other things, did not the contrary prevail, that is, that God might both be converted into all things, and yet continue what He is.—*De Carne Christi*, ch. 3, p. 62.

HIPPOLYTUS.—We believe according to the tradition of the Apostles, that God the Logos from heaven came down to the holy virgin Mary, in order that, having become incarnate from her, taking also a human soul, a rational I mean, having become all that man is, He might save the fallen, and might give immortality to those that believe on His name.—*Cont. Noet.*, ch. 17, *Opp.* II., p. 18.

ORIGEN.—They (the Magi) came to Judea bringing gifts, which (if I may so say) were symbolically appropriate to One compounded of God and man—gold as to a king, myrrh as to one who was to die, incense as to God. But since He was God, the Saviour of the human race, above angels who help men, an angel requited the piety of the Magi in worshipping Jesus, etc.—*Cont. Cels.*, *Bk.* i., p. 46, ed. Spencer.

Before all things believe that there is one God who hath created and perfected all things, and out of the non-existent made all things to be. Necessary is it also to believe that Jesus Christ is Lord, and in all the truth, both as to His Deity and as to His humanity.—*In Joan* xxxii. (Huetii *Origeniana* II., p. 397).

In the last times He emptying Himself became man, yet remained what he was, God.—*De Princip. Praef.*, § 4.

LACTANTIUS.—He became both the Son of God by the Spirit, and of man by the flesh; that is, both God and man. The power of God in Him was apparent from the works which He did; the frailty of man from the suffering He endured.—*Instit.*, *Bk.* iv., c. 13.

ATHANASIUS.—For Christ is one out of two opposites—perfect God and perfect man.—*In Ps.* xxi. 21.

Christ is to be pronounced perfect God and perfect man, not

THE INCARNATION.

as if the divine perfection were changed into the human perfection, which to say is impious; nor as if the two perfections are acknowledged as divided from each other, which is foreign from piety; nor by progress in virtue and reception of righteousness; but by indigent subsistence, so that one was both, perfect in all respects, the same both God and man.—*Cont. Apollinar.*, i. 16.

He did not become God being originally a man, but being God He became man.—*Cont. Arianos.*, i. 39.

AUGUSTINE.—Very man, very God; in none deceiving, in none false, because everywhere true, everywhere truth.—*In Ps.* xliv.

It is not permitted to separate the Son of man from the Son of God, because the Son of God Himself became the Son of man, not by changing what He was, but by assuming what He was not.—*Ep.* 238, n. 21.

BASIL THE GREAT.—Adequately to investigate the nature of the Logos is impossible. God on earth, God among men, not as a lawgiver, with fire, and trumpet, and smoking mountains, or by storm, and cloud, and tempest, terrifying the souls of those who heard; but in a body, mildly and gently discoursing with men cognate to Him. God (I say) in flesh, not acting from a distance as in the prophets, but having humanity cognate and conjoined to Himself, and through His flesh, cognate with ours, drawing humanity to Him.—*Homil. de Christi Generatione Sac.*, sub init. (ed. Basil, 1551).

GREGORY OF NYSSA.—As we recognize two things concerning Christ,—on the one hand the divine, and the other the human, in essence the divine, but in the economy that which is human,—we consequently confess the eternal in the Deity, and ascribe the created to the human nature.—*Ad Simplicium de Fide Opp.* III., p. 39 (ed. Morell). See also *Adv. Eunom.* Or. ii., *Opp.* II., p. 483.

CHRYSOSTOM.—Being in the form of God, Paul says, He did not count it robbery the being equal with God. Here, in respect of the Deity, he does not say He became, He took, but He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, becoming in the likeness of men. Then in respect of the humanity, we have the “took,” the “became;” this He *became*, this He *took*;

THE INCARNATION.

the other He *was*. Let us, then, neither confound nor separate. One God, one Christ the Son of God. And when I say *one*, I predicate oneness, not commixture (the latter nature changing into the former), but the union of the two.—*Hom. v., in Phil. T. IV., p. 39* (ed. Saville).

Lest hearing these things [what the Psalmist says of the Messiah, Ps. xlv. 2] thou shouldest think lightly of Him, He shows the power of His Deity. For neither does He separate the Deity from the flesh, nor the flesh from the Deity, the substance not confounding (God forbid), but showing the oneness.—*Hom. in Ps. xlv., T. I., p. 635*.

JOHN OF DAMASCUS.—By the good pleasure of God the Father, the only begotten Son and Logos of God, consubstantial with the Father and the Holy Ghost, before all ages, without beginning, who in the beginning was, . . . being perfect God, became perfect man, and accomplished the newest of all new things, the only new thing under the sun, whereby is showed the boundless power of God. For what is greater than that God should become man?—*Expositio Fidei Orthodoxae*, Bk. iii. ch. 1.

LEO THE GREAT.—The Lord Jesus Christ is one; and of very Deity and very humanity He is one and the same person; nor can the entireness of this union be severed by any division.—*Epist. lxxxi*.

It seems unnecessary to carry these citations farther. Selected for the most part from familiar addresses or letters, they may suffice to show how much the fact of the Incarnation of our Lord was recognized as a fundamental part of the Christian system by the early Christians. A close scrutiny of the passages, indeed, may lead to the discovery that their authors had not all exactly the same conception of the matter of which they wrote; but this may be overlooked here, as the passages are cited simply to show that the common belief of the early Church was that somehow the Deity was really and hypostatically united to humanity in the person of Jesus Christ.

II.

This being the case, the question arises, Whence did the early Christians derive the conception and the belief of this

THE INCARNATION.

fact? In reply to this, an attempt has been made to trace the notion to those aspirations and forebodings respecting a Theophany which we have already glanced at as floating with more or less distinctness before the minds of the heathen, or as embodied in their mythologies under different forms. But this attempt has proved futile, and may now be regarded as relinquished by all competent inquirers. There is not the shadow of resemblance between the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation and the metamorphoses and apotheoses of the Hellenic mythology; and though in the avatars, or descents of the Hindu mythology, and the dualistic hypotheses of Parsism, there may be traced a kind of analogy to the Christian doctrine, yet there are fundamental differences between them which preclude the possibility of deducing the one from the other. Even the Chrishnavatar, the ninth avatar of Vishnu, in which the deity is represented as appearing as a man "to uphold the good and overthrow the wicked, and establish piety on the earth,"* is so essentially different in conception, representation, and result, from the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation, that, though presenting some striking analogies to this, it cannot with any probability be regarded as embodying the true idea of it, still less as having originated it. According to the Christian view, the finite is indissolubly united to the infinite, yet without being confounded with it or absorbed in it; according to the Hindu representation, the infinite condescends to the finite for a season, mixes with it, and ultimately absorbs it, so that it is annihilated. According to the Christian representation, the redemption is achieved by the deliverance of the creature from all evil, and the establishment of each man in his individual personality in a perpetuity of blessedness; according to the Hindu representation, the redemption is accomplished by the destruction of individual personality, and the absorption of the creature in the Atma or All-Life. According to the Christian representation, the Incarnation of God in Jesus Christ is a singular event, without parallel, without precedent, without recurrence; according to the Hindu representation, the Chrishnavatar was one in a series of similar events, some of which preceded it, and others

* *Bhagavad-Gîtâ*, Lect. iv. 7, 8, pp. 22 and 143, ed. Schlegel, 1823.

THE INCARNATION.

followed. According to the Christian representation, when the work of Christ is completed the redemption of the world is finally secured; according to the Hindu representation, when Chrishna returned to heaven and laid aside his humanity, the Kali-yuga, or iron age, began, and evil resumed its sway. To these differences, which are of an essential kind, it is unnecessary that we should add the enormous difference in moral character and in act between the actual life of Jesus Christ and the life ascribed to Chrishna, to establish the assertion that the two representations could not have been derived from a common source, though the later may have borrowed something from the earlier, and, as is usual in such cases, disfigured it.*

Equally impossible is it to find the basis of this belief in the mind of man himself. We may admit to the full all that can be said as to the necessity under which man lies from the very concept of the finite to think of and believe in, if he cannot comprehend, the infinite; and we may grant without hesitation that, having these two before his mind, he will feel irresistibly impelled to inquire how the awful gulf between them is to be bridged over,—how the finite can have relations and intercourse with the infinite,—or how a being that is finite can come nigh to a being that is infinite, so as as to be heard by him or helped by him. Questions such as these man cannot help pondering; they are inseparable from the very notion of reli-

* "That the Indian Krishnu which is adduced by Stirn (*Apologie des Christenthums*, p. 181, ed. 2,) as a heathen analogy to the Messianic anticipations, may probably be traced to Christian influence, so far as there is actually an agreement, has been pointed out by Wuttke (*Geschichte des Heidenthums* ii., p. 339)."—Hengstenberg, *Christology of the Old Testament*, vol. iv., p. 281, Eng. Tr. The resemblance in some respects of the Persian legends concerning a superhuman deliverer for the race to the Messianic representations of the Old Testament is accounted for by Hyde (*De Relig. Vet. Persarum*, ch. x., p. 174), and other eminent scholars (see the quotations from Stuhr and Spiegel in Hengstenberg iv., 280, 281,) by the historical connection between the Jews and the Persians, and the intercourse to which this led. To some it may perchance occur that the antiquity of the Indian legends renders incredible the supposition which Wuttke has maintained. But this antiquity does not belong to the Vishnu mythology, as presented in the Puranas. In their present form the oldest of these does not ascend above the eighth or ninth century of the Christian era, and some are comparatively quite modern. See Wilson's *Translation of the Vishnu Purana*, Pref., p. lxx., and *Introduction to the Rig Veda*, vol. i.

THE INCARNATION.

gion. It is the attempt to find some answer to them that has given birth to Polytheism, and led men to people the universe with deities :—

perfugium sibi habebant omnia Divis
Tradere, et illorum nutu facere omnia flecti.*

But though man, in his anxiety to find an answer to these questions, has dreamt of deities descending to earth, and of men being raised to be gods, and in his attempts to clothe the deity in form has found in his highest æsthetic efforts no form so fitting as that of man ; yet in no case has he reached the conception of a proper incarnation, and hence we may legitimately conclude that this lies out of the sphere of mere human thought, and must therefore have been suggested to man from above. "What power of human understanding," asks Jeremy Taylor, "could have found out the incarnation of a God ; that two natures, a finite and an infinite, could have been concentrated into one hypostasis or person ?" And of this and other truths peculiar to Christianity he adds, "These are articles of so mysterious a philosophy, that we could have inferred them from no premises, discoursed them on the stock of no natural or scientific principles ; nothing but God and God's Spirit could have taught them us." †

There can be no reasonable doubt that the early Christians derived their knowledge of and their belief in the Incarnation of Jesus Christ from the Scriptures, and especially from the teaching of Christ Himself and His Apostles. In the Old Testament, this fact, though not formally announced, is not obscurely intimated ; and that the early Christians found it there is evident from the appeal which they make in arguing for it to the Old Testament. It is true that the Jews for the most part did not discover from their own Scriptures that the Messiah whom they expected was to be God-man ; and this may seem to authorize the conclusion that the Christian Fathers rather imposed their own belief on the ancient Scriptures than drew it thence ; but the Jews, we know, read the Old Testament with a veil upon their hearts which prevented their seeing much that is plainly there, and caused

* Lucret., *De Nat. Rer.*, v., 1186-7.

† *Serm. on Rom.* viii. 9, 10. *Works* by Hughes, vol. ii., p. 149.

them to err exceedingly in their interpretations of its teachings.* It is evident also from their fancy of a double Messiah, the Messiah Ben David and the Messiah Ben Joseph, the one a glorious and superhuman being, the other infirm and suffering, that they were perplexed with the discrepancy which they found in the prophetic writings in the descriptions of the Messiah, and fell upon this fiction as the only hypothesis by which they thought this was to be overcome.† Their doctrine also of a double Metatron, the one identical with the Shechinah, the other a mere man, affords another evidence of the same fact.‡ It seems certain also from such cases as those of Mary, Zacharias, Simeon, Nathanael, and the Samaritans mentioned in the New Testament,§ that not only among the Jews, but even among their less privileged neighbours, there were some at least who had attained to a higher conception of the personal dignity and spiritual work of the Messiah than prevailed generally in Judea at the time of our Lord's advent.||

* 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15; Matt. xxii. 29.

† Hengstenberg's *Christology*, iv. 357; Kitto's *Biblical Cyclopædia*, 3rd edit., vol. iii., p. 149.

‡ See the passages cited by Hengstenberg, iv. 326. Some things taught by the Rabbins concerning the Metatron seem to have been borrowed from Christian sources; as, for instance, that he alone has the privilege of sitting in the presence of God, the angels having to stand (Chagiga I., c. i.); which seems a sort of distorted reflection of the Christian representation of the Christ as sitting at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens.

§ Luke i. 46 ff. 67 ff., 67 ff.; ii. 55 ff. John i. 50; iv. 25, 29, 42. See Bp. Horsley's Sermon on this last passage.—*Sermons*, vol. ii., p. 251.

|| That the opinion of the Jews generally concerning the nature of the Messiah was that which Justin puts into the mouth of Trypho when he adduces him as saying πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν χριστὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενῆσθαι (*Dial.* c. 49; *Opp.* ed. Otto. I., p. 158), cannot be doubted. Attempts have been made to prove the contrary by reference to the statements of the Targumists concerning the מִלְכָּא דִּי יְהוֹנָתָן, the Word of Jehovah, and those of Philo concerning the Logos. But it cannot be shown in any of the instances in which the Targumists introduce the *Memra dayeya* that they identify this with the Messiah; and with respect to the Logos of Philo it is too impersonal and purely speculative a conception to bear any tangible resemblance to that of the Messiah. At the same time there are utterances in the Targums (as for instance on Is. ix. 6), and in some of the Rabbinical books (see the passages cited by Bertholdt in his *Christologia Judæorum*) which go far to show that the deity of the Messiah was not altogether hid from the minds of the Jews. It is not improbable that their antagonism to Christianity induced them to give greater prominence to the human side of the Messiah's person, and this may have led to their own belief becoming more pronounced and exclusive in respect of this.

THE INCARNATION.

But it is from the New Testament more immediately that the early Christians drew their belief in the Incarnation. Receiving the four gospels as authentic narratives of what Jesus said and did during His life on earth, they could not fail to recognize in Him one who, though in outward form a very man, yet spoke and acted as consciously God. One who performed miracles in His own name and according to His own will; who assumed to forgive sins; who freely asserted His pre-existence; who spoke of having come down from heaven, and of being in heaven even when on earth; who asserted His unity with God in the sense of being in God even as God was in Him; who declared His identity with the Father to be such that any who had seen Him had seen the Father; who claimed the same honour from men as they rendered to the Father; who allowed His followers and others to offer Him divine honours; who asserted an independent right to live or die as He pleased; and who declared that all power in heaven and on earth was given to Him, and that He would be everywhere present with His followers even to the end of the world;* must be one who, unless He were a deceiver of marvellous adroitness and unparalleled audacity, was really and verily God manifest in the flesh of man.

With not less force and conclusiveness would the utterances of the Apostles in their writings respecting their Master impress on them the conviction that He was indeed Incarnate God. The very way in which the Apostles refer to His humanity as in itself something marvellous, and the stress which they lay on the fact of His appearing in human nature as a proof of unparalleled condescension on His part, are of themselves sufficient to show that they did not regard Him as a mere man. What in the experience of men are events of the most ordinary and commonplace occurrence; events which occur in the case of every man, and without which, indeed, no man comes into being; are in His case referred to as things marvellous and mysterious. That He should have had a woman for His mother; that He should have been poor and

* Mark ii. 3—12; John iii. 13; viii. 58; xiv. 6—14; x. 15; xiv. 9; v. 23; Matt. viii. 2; ix. 18; xiv. 33; xv. 25; xxviii. 9, 17; John xx. 28; xxi. 15 ff.; x. 18; Matt. xxviii. 18.

THE INCARNATION.

despised ; that He should have been subject to the divine law ; that He should have suffered pain and sorrow ; and most of all, that He should have died ;—these are what the Apostles adduce as evidences of unexampled condescension, benevolence, and submission on the part of their Master, though they are things which they must have known to be incident to all men, and of which they themselves had or were sure to have experience.* Such representations are utterly unaccountable except on the supposition that the Apostles knew that their Master was, as respects His proper and original nature, superior to and independent of all such experiences, and that it was only of His own will that He submitted to them. And when it was perceived that along with this they spoke of Him as God in the proper sense of the term ; ascribed to Him divine attributes, works, and honours ; prayed to Him as omniscient and omnipotent ; represented His humanity as that which He who was God became ; and declared that He was the image of the invisible God, the radiance of His glory, and the impression of His essence,† that He was in the form of God, and that in Him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily ; the only alternative that presented itself to the minds of the early Christians was either that they must regard the Apostles as labouring under some bewildering delusion as to the being and nature of their Master, or that they were bound to accept, on the ground of apostolic teaching, that Jesus was very God as well as very man. The former side of this alternative they felt they could not adopt without being constrained to renounce Christianity altogether ; and therefore they embraced the latter, to which they felt themselves shut up. On the same

* 2 Cor. viii. 9 ; Phil. ii. 5—8 ; Gal. iv. 4 ; Heb. ii. 14—18 ; v. 8 ; 1 Pet. iii. 18 ; 1 John iii. xvi ; Rev. i. 5, etc.

† Heb. i. 3 : 'Απαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. Hesychiuss explains ἀπαύγασμα as ἡλίου φέγγος, and Chrysostom gives φῶς ἐκ φω. ὅς, *light of light*, as the exegesis of the words of the apostle. χαρακτὴρ is the impression of a seal on wax or any other substance that receives and retains such an impression. The word occurs only this once in the New Testament. Philo uses it of the αἰδιος λογος which he calls “the impression of the seal of God,” σφραγιδὶ θεοῦ ἧς ὁ χαρακτὴρ ἐστὶν αἰδιος λόγος. *De Plant. Noe*, p. 217, A. The rendering of ὑπόστασις, by “person” is not authorized either by classical or by New Testament usage. It means *substance, nature, essence*, and ethically *confidence or assurance*.

THE INCARNATION.

grounds and with the same assurance has the universal Church continued to retain this belief to the present day.

III.

Had Christians rested content with accepting the *fact* of the Incarnation on the ground of Scripture testimony, the Church might have been spared much perplexing discussion, and much bitter, nay furious conflict. It may be doubted, however, whether it be possible for the human mind to accept such a fact without speculating upon it, and endeavouring to arrive at some theory of it, or at least at some way of describing it such as shall enable a thoughtful man to construe it to himself. It may be at once admitted that the *explanation* of the fact lies beyond our reach; that with our limited capacity and knowledge we can never say *how* it is that the divine and human natures are united in Christ Jesus. But this will not prevent our trying to conceive and represent the union of the two natures in the one Person, in such a way as shall not either virtually give up what we profess to believe, or involve a contradiction in terms, and therefore a logical absurdity. Besides, it is perhaps impossible to read thoughtfully the statements of Scripture bearing on this subject without trying at least to form some theory on which they may be reconciled to each other.

That this necessity was felt by the early Christians is evident from the opinions advanced by Eutyches, Apollinarius, and others respecting the two natures in Christ. These were denounced by the dominant party in the Church as heretical, but in reality they were attempts made by sincere believers to represent to themselves and others in an intelligible way the facts concerning the Person of the Saviour which they had received. All of them held the proper deity and the proper humanity of Jesus Christ; they erred only, where they erred at all, in the theory they adopted as to the manner in which these two natures were united in Him. What chiefly troubled them was to conceive how there could be but one Christ, one conscious personality, and yet two distinct natures; and the hypotheses they advanced had in view the removal of this apparent con-

THE INCARNATION.

tradition. Apollinarius, proceeding from the trichotomical view of man's nature, as consisting of body, soul, and spirit, supposed that in Jesus the body and soul were simply human, and that the divine nature supplied in Him the place of the spirit (*πνεῦμα*), or rational mind (*νοῦς*). So far was he from denying or doubting the union of the divine and human natures in Jesus Christ, that Gregory of Nyssa, his most able opponent, says expressly that he held that Jesus "is God by the Spirit that became incarnate, but man by the flesh assumed by God."* His theory is confessedly erroneous; for even supposing his psychological data to be correct, admitting that there is such a distinction between the soul and spirit of man as he assumes, his representation of the Deity as supplying the place of the spirit in the man Christ Jesus, is incompatible with either a true belief in our Lord's proper humanity, or a true belief in His proper deity. If it be essential to the nature of man that he be composed of body, soul, and spirit, then a being who is only body and soul is not a complete, proper man; and on the other hand if in Jesus Christ the divine Logos supplied the place of the rational nature or spirit of man, there was no proper incarnation of deity in Him, but simply a divine power exerted, by which a deficiency in His constitution was supplied. Besides, on this hypothesis what are we to make of such a statement as that Jesus "groaned [was violently agitated]† in His spirit"; or how are we to understand our Lord's own words on the cross, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit"?‡ Was it the divine nature only that was agitated at the grave of Lazarus? Was it the divine Logos that Jesus gave up to the Father when He died? This surely no one will say; and this is sufficient to set aside the Apollinarian theory. But though the ancient Church did well to reject the doctrine of Apollinarius, it seems harsh to denounce him as a heretic, seeing he did not professedly reject any revealed truth, but only erred in his attempt to represent a fact which he accepted.

The hypothesis which is associated with the name of Eutyches, but which was not peculiar to him, was also framed with

* *Θεὸς μὲν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ σαρκωθέντι, ἄνθρωπος δὲ τῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ῥοσληφθείσῃ σαρκί.*—*Adv. Apollin.*, c. 7.

† *ἑνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι.*—John xi. 33.

‡ Luke xxiii. 46.

THE INCARNATION.

a view to the reconciling of the assertion of the unity of the Saviour's Person with the assertion of His combined deity and humanity. Standing upon the express words of Scripture that "the Word became flesh," that "the Son of God was made of a woman," that Jesus was "Emmanuel, God with us," and such-like utterances, this school maintained that there was in Jesus only one Person, and only one nature—that of the Θεάνθρωπος, or God-man. It is remarkable that one of the clearest enunciations of this opinion is found in a work ascribed to the orthodox Athanasius. "We confess," says he, "that there is one, the Son of God and God according to the Spirit, the Son of man according to the flesh; not that two natures are the one Son—one to be worshipped, one not to be worshipped; but one nature of God the Word incarnate, to be worshipped with His flesh in one worship."* This Monophysite view was adopted in the West by the Romish bishop Julius I., who says: "It is harmoniously confessed that the body [of Christ] was of the Virgin, the deity from heaven; the body was formed in the womb, the deity uncreated, eternal; that the Logos becoming one with the body, the deity might remain undivided." Hilary of Poitiers was (to say the least) strongly inclined to this view,† and it became the prevalent view of the Egyptian Christians. Gradually, however, the doctrine of two natures in one Person came to be clearly defined and generally accepted as the doctrine of the Catholic Church. That doctrine is thus tersely stated by Augustine, than whom none did more to establish it in the Church: "When the Word became flesh, the Word did not pass into flesh, and perishing thus cease; but the flesh, that it might not perish, was added to the Word; that as in man there is soul and body, so Christ might be God and man, the same God who is man, and the same man who is God, not by confusion of nature, but by unity of person."‡ The deity thus united to humanity was

* *De Incarn. Dei Verbi. Opp.*, i. 1 ed. Montfaucon. Some have strenuously defended the genuineness of this treatise; but the reasons against this are such that it can hardly be retained. See Möhler, *Athanasie le Grand*, T. iii., p. 254. It must be confessed, however, that Athanasius often uses phraseology hardly in keeping with the doctrine of which he is generally regarded as the prime defender.

† See Münscher's *Dogmengeschichte*, iv. 16. Dörner's *Entwicklungsgesch.*

‡ Proinde cum Verbum caro factum est, non Verbum in carnem

THE INCARNATION.

believed to there "immutabiliter" in the unchangeable fulness and perfection of His essence; and when the question was asked, How then could Jesus suffer and die? the answer of Augustine was, "As a man, for instance, who is a philosopher is so only in respect of his mind, and yet there is no absurdity in saying, A philosopher is slain, A philosopher is dead, though this is true only of his body, and not of that in virtue of which he is a philosopher; so is it with Jesus Christ, of whom it may be said that He is the Son of God and the Lord of Glory, and such like, which things are said in respect of the Word, yet may it also be said that God was crucified, though we are certain that He suffered thus according to the flesh, not according to that in respect of which He is the Lord of Glory."*

The doctrine thus enunciated was established by the decree of the Council or Synod of Chalcedon in A.D. 451, and continued to be the accepted belief of the Church through the middle ages.† It is still the doctrine alone accredited in the Romish Church.‡ Substantially, this is also the doctrine of the Calvinistic or Reformed Churches of the Continent, as well as of the Protestant Churches in this country. Luther and his followers, while steadfastly adhering to the doctrine of the two natures in the one Person of Christ, repudiated the view given by Augustine in the passage last cited from him as to the relation of the two

pereundo cessit, sed caro Verbo, ne ipsa periret, accessit; ut quemadmodum homo est anima et caro, sic esset Christus Deus et Homo, idem Deus qui Homo, et qui Deus idem Homo, non confusione naturae, sed unitate personae.—*Sermo 15 in Natali Domini*, Opp. ed. Erasmi. T. x., col. 601. He repeats this in almost the same words in his Epistle to Volusianus; Ep. 3 [al. 137] Opp., T. ii., col. 11. Besides the union of the soul and body in man, the Fathers use other analogies to illustrate the divine and human natures in Christ,—as wool soaked in blood, red-hot iron (Basil, *Hom. in S.S. Christi generat.*), the air filled with light (August. *ad Volusianum*, n. 11), etc.—in all of which there is the pervading union of two substances, but only one material.

* "Sicut homo, verbi gratia, philosophus non utique nisi secundum animam dicitur nec ideo tamen absurde dicimus philosophum caesum, philosophum mortuum, cum totum secundum carnem accidat non secundum illud quo est philosophus: ita Christus Deus; et tamen recte dicitur Deus crucifixus, cum hoc eum secundum carnem passum esse non secundum illud quo Dominus gloriae est, non habeatur incertum."—Ep. 169, *ad Evodium*, c. 8.

† See Lombard, *Sentent.* Lib. iii., Dist. 5 and 6; Aquinas, *Summae Part. Tert. Quaest.* ii.—vi.; Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, Lib. ii. c. 7.

‡ See Schnappinger, *Doctr. Dogmatum Ecclesiae*, T. i. p. 63; Klee, *Kathol. Dogmatik*, Bd. ii., s. 433 ff. 2 te Aufl.

THE INCARNATION.

natures to each other. This view, which was strenuously advocated by Zwingli, and to which he gave the name of *Alloiosis* (ἀλλοίωσις, from ἀλλοῖος, of another sort),* Luther angrily condemned, even to execration.† His zeal against it was kindled chiefly because it stood in the way of the view he had espoused as to the real corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist. According to Zwingli, the elements in the Eucharist are merely signs of spiritual truths, and simply remind of Christ so as to bring the intelligent and believing communicant spiritually into fellowship with the Saviour;‡ according to Calvin, they are not only signs, with which the substantial reality is conjoined, but along with this seals of Christ's grace to the believing recipient, to whom the Holy Spirit, "penes quem agendi virtus residet," conveys the blessing;§ but according to Luther, they are far more than this, and bring with them the very body of the Saviour into the recipient. The Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation he renounced; in his view, there was no actual passing of the substance of Christ's body and blood into the elements; he renounced also the doctrine of a real sacrifice in the mass; but he held, notwithstanding, firmly by the belief that the body and blood of Christ are actually there, and are received by the communicant.|| In seeking support for this view, he was led

* *Est ἀλλοίωσις . . . desultus aut transitus aut si mavis permutatio, qua de altera in ea natura loquentes alterius vocibus utimur. Ut cum Christus ait Caro mea vere est cibus, caro propria est humanæ in illo naturæ attamen per commutationem hoc loco pro divina ponitur natura.*—Zwingli, *Opp.* ed. Schulthess iii., 525.

† See his strong words quoted by Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, vol. ii., p. 328, Eng. Tr. "Ex quo mota est contentio ipse [Lutherus] modum excessit, tum in declaranda opinione sua, tum in aliis nimia verborum acerbitate vituperandis."—Calvin, *De Coena Dom.*, *Opp.* viii., p. 9.

‡ In his earlier writings Zwingli speaks as if he considered the Sacrament as conveying little or no benefit to the recipient, but as simply attesting to others his faith. "Sunt sacramenta signa vel ceremoniæ quibus se homo ecclesiæ probat militem esse Christi, redduntque ecclesiæ totam potius certiorum de tua fide quam te."—*De Vera et falsa religione*, *Opp.* II., 199. Subsequently, however, he taught decidedly that the Eucharist by bringing before the mind "Omnia quæ nobis divina liberalitate per Christum donata sunt," tends to advance the spiritual interests of the believing recipient. See especially his Confession of Faith presented to Francis I. of France, in Christoffel's *Huldreich Zwingli Leben und Ausgewählte Schriften*, s. 280 ff.

§ *Instit. Rel. Christ.*, Lib. iv. c. 14, 17.

|| Wir halten dass Christus nicht allein also gegenwärtig sei mit dem

to adopt the thesis of the "Communicatio idiomatum," that is, the communication by the divine Word of the attributes and qualities peculiar to Himself to the human nature which He had assumed, and *vice versâ*. The phraseology in which Luther and his followers clothed their thesis was not new; it occurs in the writings of the scholastic divines; but while the latter used it merely to express the fact of an interchange of names and appellations between the divine and human natures in Christ, the former meant it to convey the idea of a real communication of essential properties from the one nature to the other.* Luther's belief was that the ground on which what properly and originally belongs only to Deity can be affirmed of humanity in Christ; is not that both natures are combined in one Ego, but that both are joined through the *Unio*; the word Man itself carries with it the concept of Deity, because it has become "another and new word," with a new significance.† Luther was thus able to persuade himself that Omnipresence might belong to the Man Christ Jesus, and consequently that, not in Spirit merely, but really as Incarnate God (though not locally), He was present in the Eucharist. It was not solely, however, in the interest of his peculiar views on this point regarding the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, that Luther was earnest in advocating the doctrine of the

Brod im Sacrament, durch seine Wirkung oder wie etliche reden *virtualiter et effective*. Wir halten auch dass Christus gegenwärtig mit dem Brod ist nicht allein nach der Gottheit. Wir halten das auch Leib und Blut Christi *substantialiter* und wesentlich gegenwärtig ist mit Brod und Wein im Sacrament. *Werke*, Bd. xvii. s. 2490.

* Traces of such an hypothesis may be found in some of the later Greek fathers. Thomas of Damascus says: ἐν ρηεὶ ὁ Χρ σὺς καθ' ἑκάτεραν τῶν αὐτοῦ φύσεων, καὶ ἐνεργεῖ ἑκάτερα φύσις ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας· κοινωνεῖ τοίνυν ἡ μὲν θεὰ φύσις τῇ σαρκὶ ἐνεργοῦσῃ διὰ τὸ εὐδοκίᾳ τῆς θεᾶς θελήσεως παραχωρεῖσθαι πάσχειν καὶ πράττειν τὰ ἴδια καὶ διὰ τὸ τὴν ἐνεργεῖαν τῇ σαρκὶ πάντων εἶναι σωτήριον· ὅπερ οὐ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἐνεργείας ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ τῆς θεᾶς. κ. τ. τ.—*Expos. Fidei Orthodoxæ*, Lib. iii., c. 19. See also Lib. iv., c. 3, where he asserts that the flesh of Christ is to be worshipped, οὐ δι' αὐτήν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ἡνωμένον αὐτῇ κ. θ' ὑπόστασιν Θεὸν Λόγον. Cyrill of Alexandria speaks of the Logos as so combining the two natures that *eis ἐν ἀμφω συλλέγει καὶ ὡς περ ἀνακρίνας τὰ τῶν φύσεων ἰδιώματα*. Eutyches adopted this view, but in such a way as to fall into Doketism, for according to him the divine so preponderated over the human in the *ένώσις* that the body of Christ was no longer *σάρξ ὁμοούσιος ἡμῖν*.—Mansi, *Concil.*, T. v., p. 320; vi., p. 744.

† Dorner, *Entwicklungsgeschichte* II. 568. Eng. Trans., Div. II., vol. ii., p. 104.

THE INCARNATION.

"communicatio idiomatum." He was anxious to realize to himself the continued personal union of the divine and human natures in Christ from the first onward, that he might identify himself with the Saviour, and might to the full confide in the sufficiency of His propitiatory work. With those mystical tendencies which formed so marked a characteristic of his many-sided nature, he wanted to be able, without doubting, to appropriate the birth of Christ to himself, to lose his own birth in His, and to lie verily in the Virgin's bosom, and be her dear child. To his faith this was possible, if he were permitted to say that He whom the universe cannot hold lay in Mary's lap,* and that He by the power of His Deity not only raised humanity to the throne of heaven, but through His Incarnation can make our humanity partake of the Divine nature in faith.† He wanted to be able to say with Augustine, "Deus crucifixus est pro nobis;" for he felt, to use his own words, that "the Saviour were but a poor Saviour for him if He suffered only in His human nature;" and he sought some way of representing the union of the divine nature with the human in the Saviour more satisfactory to his own mind than that which Augustine had suggested. This way he thought he had discovered in his hypothesis of the "communicatio idiomatum."

To Calvin and his followers, what appeared to Luther to convey a real truth, seemed nothing more than a figure of speech. Calvin compares the union of the two natures in Christ to the union of soul and body in man; and says that, as we may say of the soul what is strictly true only of the body, and of the body what is strictly true only of the soul, and of the whole man what cannot be rationally taken of either apart; so do the Scriptures speak of Christ, attributing to Him

* Des Ew'gen Vaters ein'ges Kind,
Jetzt man in der Krippe find't,
In unser armes Fleisch und Blut
Verkleidet sich das ewige Gut.
Den aller Welt-Kreis nie beschloss
Der liegt in Mariens Schloss
Er ist ein Kindlein worden klein
Der alle Ding' erhält allein.*

† See Dörner II., 569.

* Hymn by Luther; No. 578 in the *Geistlichen Liederschatz*. Berl. 1832.

THE INCARNATION.

sometimes what pertains only to His humanity, at other times what pertains only to His deity, and occasionally what comprehends both natures, but does not suit either by itself; and this conjunction, he adds, of a double nature in Christ, the Scriptures so express that they sometimes communicate the two with each other; which trope was called by the ancients *ἰδιωμάτων κοινωνία*.* With Calvin, then, the communication of properties of which Luther made so much, was only a trope or rhetorical form of speech. The Augustinian view was that by which he and his followers held. According to them, the life of Jesus Christ had its functions in two parallel lines, the divine and the human. They believed that from the first the Logos in all His divine power was in Jesus; but that His human nature advanced from ignorance to knowledge, that as a man He learned obedience, was limited in time and space, suffered and died. They held along with this the unity of Christ's Person; in the one Ego, that of the Logos, all the momenta of both lives came to consciousness; and from this identity came the theanthropic character of His manifestation. He was God-man, one Person, inasmuch as the divine Logos was the central, controlling power, at once the fountain of both lives, and the point in which they coalesced.

These representations, though advanced and accepted by men of the greatest eminence, can hardly be received as satisfactory. It is not that they place before us what we cannot construe to the logical understanding so as fully to comprehend it; this objection could have no weight with those who have already admitted the fact of the Incarnation; for as this in itself is above human reason, it is only to be expected that everything belonging to it should be equally so. The great difficulty is to reconcile such representations with the statements of Scripture, and with themselves, so as to avoid self-contradiction.

To say that two intelligent natures, the one of which is omniscient and omnipotent, while the other is limited and subject to infirmity, and has to acquire wisdom and knowledge by degrees, are united in one personality, have but one self-consciousness, is, disguise it as we may, little better than a

* *Instit.*, Lib. ii., c. 14, § 1.

THE INCARNATION.

contradiction in terms. The doctrine of Calvin seems to lead either to Apollinarianism or to Dokerism. For if the Logos was the intelligent self-conscious power in Jesus, then it occupied in Him the place which the intellect (νοῦς) or spirit (πνεῦμα) occupies in man; or if it so absolutely subordinated the human to itself that the latter ceased to be self-conscious, then the human nature of Christ was such in appearance only, not in reality. There seems no escape from this dilemma, unless we maintain that both the divine and the human natures retained full self-consciousness; and in this case we should assert a double personality as well as two natures.

If Luther's mode of representing the relation of the divine and human natures in Christ to each other avoids this difficulty, it is exposed to the no less serious objection that it is irreconcilable with what the New Testament so explicitly states concerning the limited and progressive intelligence of Jesus Christ. We read that "He grew in wisdom as well as in stature," that the Spirit of God descended and rested upon Him; that He was led by the Spirit; and He Himself told His disciples there were things which He, the Son of Man, did not know.* How, we may ask, was this limited and advancing intelligence possible, if the Logos, dwelling in Him in fulness from the womb, communicated to His humanity divine perfections, and among the rest omniscience? Or if the divine nature within Him communicated its perfections to His human nature, what need was there for His being endowed with the Spirit? or how was He subject to the Spirit's leading?

It is in vain to attempt to escape from these difficulties by appealing to the distinction between the *possession* of a faculty and the *use* of it, and saying that in Jesus there may have resided the full properties of Deity, though He may not always have willed to use them; for this fails to become applicable in the very case in which the difficulty is most pressing. We can conceive of God restraining His omnipotence; we know that He does this; and we can extend the supposition to all His physical attributes; and so there is no difficulty in believing that though the Logos communicated to the man Jesus omnipotence, He did not always will to put that forth. But the

* Luke ii. 52; John i. 32, 33; Matt. iii. 16; iv. 1; Mark xiii. 32.

difficulty is not here; it is with the intellectual attributes of Deity that it lies in regard to Jesus Christ. The question is, How if He possessed divine intelligence He needed to grow in knowledge? How if He possessed omniscience, there was anything He did not know? And obviously it is no answer to this to say He had omniscience, but did not will to use it, for this is simply impossible, the possession in such a case being inseparable from the use. The only alternative seems to be either to suppose that omniscience was not communicated to Jesus as a man, or to maintain that one and the same person can be both omniscient and not omniscient at one and the same time. The latter side of this alternative none can adopt; and if the former be embraced, the hypothesis of the communication of properties must be given up.*

Under the pressure of these difficulties and objections, many theologians of note have shown a tendency of late years to depart from the older formulæ, and whilst holding fast by the fact of the Incarnation, to endeavour to represent it in a manner less open to objection and more closely in accordance with Scripture statement. By these writers stress is laid on the following considerations.

1. Scripture nowhere expressly teaches that two natures, the divine and the human, were united in the one person of Jesus Christ. It speaks of Him in many places as God, and ascribes to Him attributes, honours, and works that belong only to God; and in other places it speaks of Him as man, and ascribes to Him what is properly characteristic of humanity. But in no case does it say that He was God *and* man in one person. Its teaching on this head is properly summed up in the title

* The Schoolmen, who never shunned encountering difficulties, have sought by various expedients to overcome this one. The distinction taken by Durandus (*in Sent.* III., *dist.* 14, *qu.* 2), Scotus (*in Sent.* III., *dist.* 14, *qu.* 2, 4), and others, between what Jesus knew by intuition in the vision of God, and what He knew as actually happening, and consequently by experience, is not without its value, especially as bearing on our Lord's increase in knowledge. But it does not meet the difficulty wholly, for there still remains His declaration that He did not know the time when certain things should happen, which cannot be ranked under the head of knowledge of actual facts gained by experience. The suggestion of Aquinas (*Sum.* iii. 12, 2) that our Lord increased in knowledge and wisdom simply by *manifesting* increasingly what He always had, is rather an evasion than a solution of the difficulty.

THE INCARNATION.

EMMANUEL, "God with us," as applied to Jesus Christ ; of which GOD-MAN may be regarded as the equivalent.

2. Scripture nowhere teaches that the Logos *assumed* human nature into union with His own. The teaching of Scripture is uniformly to the effect that the Logos *became* man. When the angel announced to Mary the honour that was to be conferred on her, he said to her, "that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." John expressly says, "The Word became (*ἐγένετο*) flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory as of the only begotten of the Father." Paul says, no less expressly, "When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son made of a woman, made under the law." He speaks of Him also as "the man Christ Jesus," as "the second man, the Lord from heaven," as "the image of the invisible God," and as the manifestation of God in the flesh.* Such statements justify us in believing and asserting that in Jesus Christ there was a true incarnation of God, that God became man in Him, that when He was present there was an apocalypse or manifestation of the invisible God ; and they enable us to understand how Paul should use so strange an utterance as that God has purchased the Church with His own blood.† But they do not seem to authorize the assertion that the divine Logos *took on Him* or *assumed* human nature into union with His own. The only passage which seems to favour such phraseology is Heb. ii. 16, as it appears in the English authorized version, where we read, "For verily He took not on Him the nature of angels, but took on Him the seed of Abraham," which may be understood to mean that He assumed the nature that belonged to the seed of Abraham. But had the apostle meant to affirm anything as to the *nature* of our Lord, he would not have specified Abraham as the type which He assumed, for the nature of Abraham was not different from that of any other descendant of Adam ; he would have ascended to the fountain-head of the race, and said that He took on Him the nature of Adam.

* 1 Tim. ii. 25 ; 1 Cor. xv. 47 ; 2 Cor. iv. 4 ; Col. i. 15 ; 1 Tim. iii. 16. I do not doubt that the proper reading in this verse is *ὁς*, not *θεός*. But if we ask "*Who* was manifested in the flesh?" the only possible answer seems to me to be *God*, "the living God" of ver. 15.

† Acts xx. 28. See Alford's note on this passage.

THE INCARNATION.

But, as most scholars admit, our English version is at fault in this passage. What the apostle says is that Christ took on Him the help (or undertook the case) not of angels, but of the seed of Abraham.* His words refer to the design of Christ's work, and have no reference whatever to the constitution of His person.

3. The Scriptures represent our Lord as having relinquished the being on an equality with God, and as having emptied or despoiled Himself,† when He was made in the likeness of men, *i. e.*, appeared as a man under the ordinary conditions of humanity. They speak of Him as, though originally rich, having for our sakes become poor. They depict His whole condition on earth as one of humiliation and voluntary submission to and dependence on the Father. And in accordance with this they represent the condition on which He entered, after his work on earth was finished, as a resuming of the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, and which He had for a season laid aside ; and it is in reference to this His exalted state that the apostle says (using the present tense) “in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.”‡ In some sense, then, during His earthly life, it is alleged, the Deity was in abeyance, and only after His ascension did the fulness of it and of its glory appear in Him.

Founding on these statements of Scripture, various hypotheses have been advanced as to the constitution of our Lord's person. By some a *gradual* communication of the Deity to the humanity of Christ has been supposed, so that the God-man in fulness was not the beginning, but the climax and consummation, of our Lord's manifestation on earth. By others a view has been advanced which looks like a revival of the doctrine of Apollinarius, for they hold that the Son of God so became man that the Logos came in the place of the human soul, and suffered His eternal self-consciousness and will to be

* Dean Alford's version, is "It is not angels that He helpeth, but it is the seed of Abraham that He helpeth."

† εαυτον ἐκένωσεν, Vulg. *semetipsum exinanivit*; Syr. ܐܢܝܡܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
animum ejus (seipsum) evacuavit.

‡ 2 Phil. ii. 6—11; 2 Cor. vii. 9; John xx. 5, 17 ff; vi. 38 ff; xiv. 24, 28, 31; xvii.; Col. ii. 9.

THE INCARNATION.

in abeyance for a season, that He might resume it as gradually developed in humanity. Not a few divines of eminence have advanced the opinion that not in the sphere of the immanent or absolute perfections of God, such as blessedness, moral goodness, eternity, and such like, but in that of His relative perfections, those having respect to the created universe, such as omniscience, omnipotence, etc., did the *κένωσις* or *exinanitio* of the Logos take place when He became flesh. And some have even ventured on the suggestion that in the incarnate Logos an entirely new nature began to be, that of the God-man, which beginning in feebleness, gradually advanced, till at the Ascension it shone forth in all the fulness of Deity in a bodily form.*

These hypotheses, though differing in some respects from each other, all proceed on the assumption that it was not Deity in the full perfection of His essence that entered from the first into union with humanity in the person of Jesus, but that the divine Logos was pleased, that He might enter into union with a limited nature, to lay aside some at least of His proper attributes, to be resumed, either gradually as His life on earth advanced, or all at once on His return to His heavenly glory.

It is no valid objection to such representations that they predicate of the divine nature what is impossible; for to mere natural reason the simple fact of the Incarnation appears as impossible as any hypothesis that may be adduced for the purpose of representing it can be, provided it is not self-contradictory; and if we accept the one as possible, we are not in circumstances to deny the possibility of the other. Nor is there any weight in the objection that such representations savour of Monophysitism, for though Monophysitism came to be denounced as heretical after the Council of Chalcedon, in A.D. 451, yet if it can be shown to be authorized by Scripture, we are bound to accept it.

A more serious objection to these representations is that they seem to tend to throw too much into the background our Lord's true and proper Deity. If the Augustinian view, by

* See Dorner II., 1259 ff., Eng. Tr., Div. II., vol. iii., p. 248 ff.; Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk*, 2 Bde, 1855; Hofmann, *Der Schriftbeweis*, 2 Bde, 1852; Gess, *Die Lehre von der Person Christi*, Bas., 1856.

THE INCARNATION.

abstracting too much from His humanity, tends to Docketism, these views by abstracting too much from His Deity tend to a more dangerous error, that of Psilanthropism.

Besides, while these representations aim at doing justice to one class of statements in Scripture relating to our Lord's Person, there are others which their authors seem to have not sufficiently regarded, and with which their views do not seem to be compatible. Our Lord's constant and full consciousness of Deity, even in His seasons of deepest humiliation; His repeated assertions of essential unity and equality with the Father, even when speaking of Himself as His servant and apostle; His assertion of the peculiar attributes of God as belonging to Him, even during His humiliation; His accepting of divine honours from His followers, and His manifestation of divine powers in the working of miracles and the reading of the unuttered thoughts of men;—these and other indications of His true and proper Deity seem to forbid our supposing that His emptying of Himself, so as to become man, implied the relinquishment for a season of any part of the fulness of Deity.

It may be also asked whether too much has not been made by these writers of the apostle's declaration that our Lord in becoming man "emptied Himself"? Beyond all doubt this must mean that He underwent some change, and descended from His own proper condition to an inferior condition, in which He was humbled and suffered. But there is no necessity for our concluding that this involved any change in His essential properties, or the laying aside of any of His peculiar attributes. A change of state is not a change of nature; the relinquishment of dignity and majesty is not the giving up of inherent qualities or properties. And that what our Lord relinquished in order to become man was not His divine nature or any of its properties, but simply the glory—the state and majesty and manifest authority—which He had before His Incarnation, appears not only from His own words, when He speaks of being reinvested with that glory which He had with the Father before the world was,* but also from the apostle's statement in the context, that what our Lord did not retain was

* John xvii. 5

THE INCARNATION.

the form of God (μορφῇ Θεοῦ), and the being on an equality with God (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ). "Being," says St. Paul, "in the form of God, He did not deem the being on an equality with God an act of robbery, but He emptied Himself," etc. Into the exegesis of this passage I cannot here enter fully; I can only submit what seems to me the just exposition. He of whom the apostle speaks was originally, and as His proper habit, in the form of God, *i. e.*, arrayed with divine glory and majesty: He, therefore, did not deem it an act of robbery to assume equal state and majesty with God;* but instead of this, He emptied Himself of that glory which belonged to Him, and took on Him the form—*i. e.*, the condition and habit—of a servant, etc. If this be a correct interpretation of the passage, there is nothing in it relating to the laying aside of the inherent divine properties by Jesus Christ when He became man; the apostle's statement refers only to His voluntary relinquishment, for a season, of the majesty and glory which He from all eternity had with the Father. We may further compare with this what the apostle says concerning our Lord's having become poor though originally rich, as elucidating and confirming the same conclusion. The riches which any one possesses are not himself, nor do they constitute any part of his inherent, essential qualities; they are his, not he—something he possesses, but which may be separated from him without his essential worth being thereby impaired. Such riches the divine Logos possessed in the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, and this was what He relinquished when He emptied Himself to become man.

But what, it may be asked, are we to make of our Lord's declaration of ignorance as to the day and hour of the last judgment, on the hypothesis that deity was fully united to humanity in his Person? "Of that day and hour," says He, "knoweth

* ἀπαγμός must be taken here in an active sense as signifying, not *res rapta*, booty, or *res rapienda*, a thing to be seized, but *actus rapiendi*, the act of seizing or violently appropriating what belongs to another. In the phrase τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, the ἴσα is used adverbially, and when εἶναι is used with an adverb in the predicate it conveys the idea of *state* or *manner of being*; e.g., Κουρήτεσαι κακῶς ἦν, "It fared badly with the Curetes" (*Il.* ix. 51); σίγα πᾶς ἔστω λῶς, "Let all the people be in silence" (*Eurip., Hec.*, 536). See Mathiae, *Gr. Gr.*, § 612; Kühner, *Ausführl. Gram.*, § 416, n. 3. Winer by Moulton, p. 221.

THE INCARNATION.

no one, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* Let us confess that there is a great difficulty here—a difficulty so great as to have tempted good St. Ambrose to reject the clause relating to the Son as an interpolation of the Arians.† We have already seen that such a declaration is wholly incompatible with the Lutheran doctrine of the communication of attributes. The attempt of Athanasius to remove the difficulty, by distinguishing between what Jesus knew as God, and what He knew as man, and asserting that it is only as respects His human nature that He here speaks,‡ savours too much of a mere evasion to commend itself, though it must be acknowledged that it has been adopted by many very eminent men.§ The view adopted by St. Augustine, and

* Mark xiii. 32.

† *De Fide*, Lib. v., cap. 8. Ambrose declares that the words relating to the Son are not in the “*Veteres Graeci Codices* ;” but to this “*Praesulis hujus pie magis quam docti judicium*,” to use the words of Mill (*Proleg.*, p. 78, col. 2, Oxon, 1707), not much weight can be attached. The existing Greek codices bear no traces of such an omission.

‡ See Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v. *κρίνω* v. 4 f.

§ Among others, the great Leibnitz, who struggles to defend it (*Opp.*, ed. Dutens, T. I., p. 13), but whose struggles only serve to show how indefensible it is. He maintains broadly that the same being may be supreme God and not supreme God, and that he may say truly in the one capacity what he could not say truly in the other. But what is this but to affirm that in Jesus Christ there was a double personality, and that He took advantage of this to utter ambiguous words? Besides, Leibnitz seems to have overlooked the fact that it is of Himself as the *Son of God* that our Lord predicates ignorance on this occasion, so that the hypothesis that He here speaks only in His human nature will not meet the case. By those who take this view it is often urged that there is no greater difficulty in the co-existence of ignorance and omniscience in one personality than there is in the co-existence of divine power or absolute blessedness with human limitation and infirmity. “Is there,” asks Bishop Ellicott, “really any greater difficulty in such a passage than in John ii. 33, 35, where we are told that these holy cheeks were wet with human tears whilst the loud voice was crying ‘Lazarus, come forth’” (*Aids to Faith*, p. 445). “Let me ask,” says Canon Liddon, “whether this co-existence of ignorance and knowledge is more mysterious than a co-existence of absolute blessedness and intense suffering” (*Bampton Lecture*, p. 463, 2nd ed.) But here again I would submit is an assumption which involves a duplication of persons; for if our Lord was at one and the same time absolutely blessed and intensely suffering, there must have been in Him two distinct personalities. There is surely in all such representations a contradiction which renders it simply impossible to receive them. Besides, on what authority is it said that the tears of Jesus at the grave of Lazarus were merely “human tears ;” or that while He was intensely suffering He was at the same time supremely blessed? When I read that God is full of compassion and of tender mercies, I find no difficulty in believing that the tears which Jesus shed were called forth

THE INCARNATION.

after him by many eminent divines, is more satisfactory, viz., that there were certain things which our Lord as the ambassador of the Father had not been commissioned to make known to men, and that among these was the time of the last judgment.* Our Lord evidently means to say that He did not know, just as the angels did not know; now they did not know because it had not been communicated to them; it follows that His not knowing was in consequence of its not having been communicated to Him as part of His Messianic message, as part of what He had to reveal to men. If this interpretation be not accepted, let the difficulty remain. In the face of so many passages proving the divine omniscience of Jesus, and in the face of His own assertion of this, it is only a *difficulty* the passage can interpose in the way of our believing that Jesus Christ was omniscient whilst on earth; it can never avail to nullify that belief.

The conclusion to which these considerations point is that whilst we hold fast by the announced fact of the Incarnation of Deity in the Person of Jesus Christ, and use this fact for the practical results it is fitted to secure, we should not be solicitous to find some formula or frame some hypothesis which shall enable us to express exactly the relation in which Deity and humanity stood to each other in Him. We are safe on such a subject in keeping as much as may be to the phraseology of Scripture in our efforts to express it. If we say that the Word that was God became man; that He who was before all worlds, and by whom all things were made, condescended to be made of a woman; that in the nature He derived from her the Deity in fulness dwelt from the first, not as a mere sojourner may dwell in a tent from which he may depart, but

by emotions in which the Deity shared with the man; and that Incarnate God should suffer does not seem to me more incredible than that God should become incarnate at all. I am at a loss also to see how the contrary view can be reconciled with full confidence in the sufficiency of our Lord's atonement; for if all the while He was suffering it was *only* His humanity that suffered, while His Deity enjoyed perfect blessedness, of what worth were these sufferings as a propitiation? Surely it was because the Deity (in some way to us unknown) shared in the sufferings that they came to possess infinite value.

* *De Trinit.*, Lib. i., c. 12. There is an able note in defence of this view in Dr. Wardlaw's *Discourses on the Socinian Controversy*. Note P., p. 539, 4th edit.

THE INCARNATION.

somehow as the soul dwells in the body, part and parcel of the man,—that the human nature was not merely added to the divine in Him, but that He, the divine, partook (*μετέσχε*) of flesh and blood with us men, so that the Deity wholly interpenetrated the humanity,—and that in some way unknown to us the Deity shared in the limitations and sufferings of the humanity, and the humanity was raised to the dignity and honours of the Deity: we keep within the limits of Holy Scripture, and yet say all that it is needful to say on the subject. Nor do such statements convey anything beyond what human reason may receive; for man, made at first in the image and likeness of God, must in his perfect state retain a capacity for God; and as Jesus Christ was perfect man, there is nothing incongruous in the supposition that in Him the Deity was incarnate, though *how* this was we cannot tell.* Beyond this, however, we may not safely go; if we venture further, we essay a flight for which our pinions are too feeble, and dare to gaze upon the intolerable brightness of a “light which is inaccessible and full of glory.”

IV.

The fact of the Incarnation, like other divine facts, has been revealed to us less as an object of speculation than for the bearing it has on matters connected with our spiritual interests and eternal welfare. A fact may lie beyond our comprehension, and yet when we know it to be a fact, we may use it for our advantage. No man can comprehend God, and yet any man accepting the fact that God is, may consider in what relations he himself stands to God, and may thence draw conclusions of the last importance to himself as a moral and accountable agent. In like manner, though no one can tell how God became man in Jesus Christ, yet when the fact is made known to us, we may be brought to perceive its bearing on matters which concern our spiritual interests, and to apprehend it so as to draw from it lessons of the deepest practical importance.

* “As man,” says Luther, was formed after the image of the invisible God, there was by this covertly indicated that God would reveal Himself to the world in the Man Christ.”—*Comment in Genes. I., 154, § 36.*

THE INCARNATION.

1. How essential is the bearing of this fact on the scheme of redemption unfolded in the Gospel! The great peculiarity of Christianity, as a method of delivering men from sin, lies in this, that it invites us to confide in a Person who has taken away sin by taking it upon Himself, and bearing it away, so that it no longer stands between us and God, and the way is thus open for our reconciliation to Him. But how is such confidence to be inspired, unless we know that He in whom we are invited thus to trust, is one competent to the mighty work He is said to have accomplished? The moment, then, we are asked to trust in Christ for our salvation, the question presses upon us, Who or what is He that we should have confidence in Him for this? We cannot put this question lightly aside. The deeper our conviction of the evil of sin, the more will it appear to us impossible that it should be cancelled by the substitutionary acting of any single being for the race, unless that being were one of such transcendent dignity and worth that a value attaches to his acting infinitely beyond what can accrue from that of any mere creature. Here lies the essential condition of such a method of salvation, without which it becomes futile. Has this condition, then, been fulfilled in the case of Him in whom the Gospel invites us to trust? The answer is supplied in the affirmative by the fact of the Incarnation. He who comes to make atonement for the transgressors is not only a partaker of our nature, so that He can suffer for us; He is also a Divine Being, whose sufferings for us must possess infinite worth and sufficiency. In Him, then, we have the essential condition of an adequate propitiation supplied; and in Him, therefore, may we rest with unwavering confidence. "If Christ," says Luther, "be not truly essentially God, we are lost. For what should I be helped by the sufferings and death of the Lord Christ, if He were only a man like myself? In this case He could not overcome the devil and death and sin; He would be too weak for this; and so He could not help us. Hence we must have a Saviour who is really God, and a Lord over sin and death, and the devil and hell. Let us give up this foundation that He is very God, and his sufferings, his death, and resurrection profit us nothing, and we have no hope of obtaining eternal life and blessedness;

THE INCARNATION.

in short, all the comfortable promises of the Bible will go for nothing to us.”*

The apostle, in one passage, in referring to the Incarnation, connects this immediately with the redemption of men as its purpose. “When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem (*ἵνα ἑξαγοράσῃ*, that He might redeem) them that were under the law,” etc.† The purpose of the Incarnation, then, was the redeeming of those who, under the law, had been brought into a condition of penalty because of their transgressions of it. Now to redeem is to recover from evil through the payment of a price or ransom; and as the ransom-price which Christ gave for us was His life, was Himself,‡ the idea of substitutionary or vicarious acting on His part for us is involved in this representation. But it must appear to all that of such an arrangement it is not only a becoming but a necessary condition that the party appearing and acting as a substitute should be of the same nature with those for whom he appears and acts. Whatever he may be besides, or more than this, this at least he must be, and really. Moral congruity requires that it should be so; a sense of harmony and fitness prescribes it; and the great ends to be answered in connexion with moral administration by a vicarious redemption of the guilty demand it. There can be no such genuine sympathy between beings of different natures as is necessary before one can voluntarily and befittingly take on him the guilt of another, and act or suffer in his stead; and there can be no just and adequate vindication of the law, which the sinner has transgressed, unless the being who appears for him be himself subject to that law, and possess the same natural fitness to keep it as the other. A being of a lower nature cannot come up to the standard required; a being of a different nature would move in a sphere which does not touch that in which the postulated obedience has to be rendered; and a being of a higher nature would not afford the moral demonstration without which the desired result cannot be obtained.

* *Werke*, vii., 1412.

† Gal. iv. 4.

‡ Matt. xx. 28; John x. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 6.

THE INCARNATION.

If man, then, is to be saved from the penalty due to his sins by the offices of another, that other must be one in man's own nature. But, on the other hand, it is no less certain that no mere man can appear as the substitute for the race, or by any means offer a ransom of sufficient worth to cancel man's guilt. The case demands the presentation of a price of measureless worth, ere man can be redeemed. How is this condition to be met, this demand to be supplied? There is but one conceivable way. The inadequacy of the human nature must be remedied by the union with it of a higher nature, the presence of which, and the participation by which in all the actings and sufferings of the being thus constituted, shall communicate to these a value adequate to the mighty result contemplated. These are the conditions on which alone a substitutionary redemption of the sinner is possible. How marvellously these conditions have been fulfilled through means of the Incarnation of the Son of God, when He who was God became flesh, and in no mere apparitional or seeming humanity, but as very man, partaking of flesh and blood like ourselves, dwelt among men, and acted and suffered on their behalf, needs not to be pointed out. The whole scheme of human redemption thus falls back on the Incarnation as its necessary basis; and in that scheme this transcendent fact finds its purpose and end.

2. What an impressive view is given to us by the fact of the Incarnation of the love and condescension of God! Suppose in our walks among the abodes of the poor and outcast we were to come on one whose high intelligence proclaimed him a man fit to give law to intellect, whose pure and blameless life was a marvel and a lesson to all around him, whose whole time was occupied in plans and acts of benevolence, and who stood out from all men we had ever seen before alike by the grandeur and the simplicity of his life: should we not wonder that one so fitted to grace the loftiest sphere should be found in one of the lowliest—that one so qualified to command should be content to serve? But suppose we were to hear that this man was actually born to move in the very highest circles of society—that it belonged to him of right to hold the sceptre of empire, and that he had of his own free choice relinquished

THE INCARNATION.

the splendours and privileges of royalty, had denuded himself of rank and wealth, and had gone down to live among the poor and wretched, that thereby he might the more effectually reach them and rescue them from their misery: with what emotions of astonishment and admiration should we not be filled as we contemplated so transcendent a pattern of condescension and benevolence! But what is this to that which is presented to us in the Incarnation? In the case supposed we have only a creature descending to the level of those who are after all his fellow-creatures—only an outward humiliation and a change of outward circumstances. But when the divine Word became flesh, He descended to a nature infinitely lower than His own; the Creator came down to submit to the conditions of the nature He had created; the King eternal and immortal condescended to claim fraternity with beings whose foundation is in the dust, and who perish before the moth; the Being who inhabiteth Eternity, and whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, submitted to dwell in a tabernacle of clay, and to shut up His glory in a tenement of dust. Here surely was “a love that passeth knowledge,” a manifestation of benevolence such as infinitely exceeds all human experience or comprehension. It is the great manifestation of God—the transcendent revelation of Him who is Love—the grandest lesson the world has ever had of Him “whom no man hath seen at any time, or can see”—a lesson which we may receive though we cannot fully grasp it, even as we receive the sunlight without being able to appropriate the orb whence it streams.

3. What a grand exhibition and exemplification have we in this of moral excellence and goodness! In God's becoming flesh there is, if one may so speak, an epitome and condensation of all virtue. Here was self-sacrifice in its highest form; here was displayed a hatred of sin so intense that no humiliation was deemed too great if thereby it might be destroyed; here was seen a reverence for moral law so profound that nothing must be refused if thereby that law was to be upheld and honoured; here were manifested a love of holiness, a desire for God's honour, a regard for the moral order and harmony of the universe, combined with pity for

THE INCARNATION.

the unhappy beings by whom that holiness had been offended, that honour outraged, and that order violated, such as human language is inadequate to express. Here, in the beautiful words of Scripture, "Mercy and truth met together, righteousness and peace kissed each other."* He who came to restore virtue to the earth, and to glorify God in that nature in which He had been insulted and dishonoured, showed in the very act of assuming that nature a pattern of virtue so comprehensive that we have only to "let this mind be in us which was also in Him," when He thus humbled Himself for our salvation, in order to clothe ourselves with all the moral excellence of which our nature is capable.

4. And as our Lord, in becoming man, has given us a pattern of moral goodness, so does He in this supply to us the most powerful incentives and motives to follow after that which is good. Here is the constraining power of love impelling us to live, not to ourselves, but to Him by whom that love was showed. Here is a demonstration not only of the value which God sets upon holiness, but of the immense worth which He attaches to human nature, leading us to reverence that nature on which he puts so high an estimate, and which He has so marvellously honoured by assuming it; and urging us, on the one hand, to avoid all that would degrade or injure it, and, on the other, to follow after all that would invest it with that "beauty of holiness" which constitutes its brightest ornament and its highest dignity. And here is the attractive force of perfect moral excellence, not set forth in mere ethical rules, or presented in fictitious models, but embodied in the actual life of one who appeared in our nature, and has showed us what that nature is capable of becoming; whilst at the same time He has given us assurance that, through Him, that nature, so desolated and degraded by sin, shall be restored to more than its pristine symmetry, and elevated to the highest place in the creation of God.

V.

Thus far, in glancing at the practical bearings of the Incarnation, we have been pursuing a path on which the clear light

* Ps. lxxxv. 10.

THE INCARNATION.

of Scripture shines; and on themes like these it is pleasant to dilate. I must now, however, pass from these to notice some other aspects of the subject, which are due rather to human speculation than to the teaching of the Word of Truth.

By some of the evangelical divines of Germany the opinion has been advanced that the Incarnation was rendered necessary not only by the existence of sin in the world, and the need of an adequate atonement ere it could be forgiven, but, even apart from this, by the fact that God, in willing a perfect revelation of Himself in the world, must have willed the manifestation of Himself in humanity, the crown of creation. It is difficult to catch with any precision what is thus intended. Were it merely meant that the world was made for Christ, with a view to His revelation of God in it, the sentiment would be one for which Scriptural authority could be pleaded,* and in which important truth is embodied. But this does not seem to be what is intended. When we are told "we must rise above the sin-and-salvation occasion of the Incarnation to a universal theanthropic basis, or the recognition of the Incarnation of God as standing in an original, essential, and necessary relation to humanity, and therewith to creation, as its completion,"† we seem to be pointed to something beyond this relation of the world to Christ as the predestined sphere of His manifestation and working. What that something is, I confess myself unable distinctly to apprehend; nor does the reason which has been advanced for such a doctrine seem to me to have any force. "This truth," says Dorner, "must be recognized by the simplest Christian consciousness as soon as it is remembered that Christianity is the perfect religion, the religion absolutely, the everlasting Gospel, and that Christ is the centre-point of this religion, without whom it cannot be thought. If it be said that Adam could have been perfected without Christ, then, since no one can think of perfection without the perfect religion, it must be assumed, consciously or unconsciously, that a double absolute religion is possible—one without Christ, and one with Christ—which is a mere

* 1 Col. i. 16.

† Liebnier, *Christliche Dogmatik*, quoted by Dorner, II., 1245.

THE INCARNATION.

contradiction."* The proper answer to this seems to be that, though Christianity is *the* perfect religion for man as he is, it is not and cannot be the absolute religion. Absolute religion is religion pure and simple—the religion of an intelligent creature, simply as such. But Christianity is not this. It is avowedly a relative religion—a religion that is adapted to the condition of man as guilty and fallen. It is not a religion simply; it is a restorative religion. In affirming, therefore, that Adam, as he came from the hand of God, might have reached perfection without Christ, we neither consciously nor unconsciously assert the possibility of two absolute religions; we, with a very distinct consciousness of what we mean, say that, had Adam not sinned, the religion of a sinless creature would have sufficed for him, and that the reason why Christianity is now the only perfect religion, is that man is no longer as Adam was before the fall, but is now in a condition where only a *remedial* system can be of any avail for his reunion with God. There is, therefore, no contradiction involved in saying that the religion of Paradise, the absolute religion, was the perfect religion for Adam, before he fell, but that sin has necessitated another system as a perfect religion for man as he at present is, and that it was to meet this necessity that God became incarnate.

There are some who have advanced the opinion that an Incarnation is necessary to the full manifestation or revelation of God; and consequently that, even had not man sinned, God must have become incarnate in order to be fully made known to His creatures. Now that the Logos came forth to manifest God to men, and that in Christ Jesus there is the fullest and most perfect revelation of God that has been given to man, we cannot doubt; and there is even good reason to believe that God has taken occasion by this to give to angels such a revelation of Himself as they had not otherwise obtained.† But it seems incompetent to argue from this the necessity of the Incarnation apart from the fact of man's having sinned, and the consequent need of an all-sufficient propitiation ere he could be redeemed and pardoned. When God puts forth any act of His

* *Entwicklungsges.* II., 1244—Eng. Tr., Div. II., vol. iii., p. 233.

† Eph. iii. 10; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. i. 12.

THE INCARNATION.

omnipotence for the accomplishment of a special end, He may use that as an occasion of securing many other ends ; but it does not follow from this, that had that special end not existed, the act would have been nevertheless put forth for the sake of these collateral and subsidiary ends. For aught we know, there may be many other ways in which the infinite wisdom and power of God could have ensured these ends besides this. Whilst then it is admitted that by the Incarnation there has come forth the most perfect and glorious revelation of God, we demur to the conclusion that this would have been the mode employed by God to reveal Himself, even had man not sinned and fallen. What we *know* is that the purposed end of the Incarnation was the redemption of sinners, and the glorifying of God through means of that. But putting that out of view, we have no ground for supposing that the Incarnation would have taken place. Surely God could reveal Himself to His intelligent creatures by other modes than by the assumption of the nature belonging to one class of them ; at any rate, we surely have no right to assume that He could not.

Others have maintained that the Incarnation of Deity is essential to a perfect development of humanity. What is meant by this is not very clear. It cannot be intended that the Incarnation was necessary for the raising of *fallen* humanity, and the full development of its faculties when restored ; for as the theory is advanced in the interest of the position that even had man not fallen an Incarnation would have been required, such an interpretation of it is precluded. We must suppose, then, that the affirmation is, that had man remained as he was when he came from God's creating hand, he could not have been carried forward to the full development of his nature except through the effect of an Incarnation of God. But on what grounds is such an affirmation made ? What right have we to assume that had man followed out, without failure or transgression, that course which God called and fitted him to pursue, he would *not* in the ordinary course of things have reached perfection ? That Jesus Christ is the Perfect Man, the crown and flower of humanity, no one doubts ; but that Adam might not have grown to the same perfection, without such an intervention as the manifestation of God in the flesh of man, is

THE INCARNATION.

more than we are entitled to affirm. Surely if God has destined men who have fallen "to be conformed to the image of His Son,"* man unfallen might have grown into that image through divine help by a mere natural progress. If we "who have borne the image of the earthly," and have been under all the degrading influences of sin, may expect through God's grace "to bear the image of the heavenly," to "be partakers of a divine nature," to "be holy as God is holy," one made "in the image and likeness of God,"† and retaining that undefaced and undiminished, might have gone on to perfection by the simple development of the powers and susceptibilities with which God had endowed him.

There seems more ground for the opinion that the Incarnation was demanded as necessary for the providing of a grand centre round which should be gathered a holy and blessed universe—of a Head of the Kingdom of God who should be also a Mediator, uniting the creature to Himself, and through Himself to God. Undoubtedly the apostle teaches that God will "re-gather (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι*) all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth,"‡ and that thus through Him the universe shall be reconciled to itself and to God. But inasmuch as we know of this only in connexion with the redemptive work of Christ, that through which He first unites men to Himself, and then through Him to God, and to all holy beings already in union with God,—seeing, in short, that the grand unity is to be brought about through the removal in the first instance of the disunity which sin has caused,—it does not appear competent for us to assume that, apart from this, or supposing this had never been required, God would have taken this peculiar way of uniting His creatures to Himself.

To certain minds such speculations seem to have an irresistible attraction; and they plunge into them with an ardour that carries them where men of a more cautious temperament, who like to advance only where they can find solid ground on which to tread, shrink from following them. Leaving them,

* Rom. viii. 29.

† 1 Cor. xv. 49; 2 Pet. i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 16.

‡ Eph. i. 10.

THE INCARNATION.

I shall now turn to one which, if less profound, is at least capable of being clearly understood, and with which in this country we are more familiar. I refer to the doctrine which assert a necessary connexion between the Incarnation as a revealed fact, and the tenet of the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, to which it is supposed to lend support. That this should be maintained by Roman Catholics, with their belief in transubstantiation, and by Lutherans, with their belief in consubstantiation, is only what may be expected; but the opinion is not confined to these bodies. By many in the Anglican Church the connexion between the two has been loudly asserted; and some have even gone the length of insinuating that a firm belief in the Incarnation can hardly be retained, where a belief in the corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament is rejected.

That such an insinuation should be ventured on in the face of the notorious fact that thousands of most sincere and intelligent Christians, members of the purest, most evangelical, and most enlightened of the Churches in Britain, on the Continent, and in America, hold with unhesitating fidelity the fact of the Incarnation, while they do not hold the doctrine of the corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament, may well excite surprise.

Why should it be supposed, let us ask, that there is any tendency in the rejection of the dogma of the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper to lead those, who are not on other grounds disposed to refuse the fact of the Incarnation, to ignore or doubt or deny that fact? Take the lowest Zwinglian view of that ordinance, according to which it is viewed as designed merely to commemorate the death of Christ, whose body and blood are symbolized by the bread and the wine, and thereby to strengthen faith in Him and stimulate affection towards Him: What is there in this, I would ask, to induce forgetfulness or neglect of the fact that He is Incarnate God? Are Zwinglians so strangely constituted that an ordinance which they regard as symbolically representing a particular fact, and as designed specially to commemorate that fact, has a tendency, because they so regard it, to make them forget or deny it? This were marvellous indeed.

THE INCARNATION.

But the majority of those who observe the Lord's Supper without believing in Christ's corporal presence there, are not Zwinglian in their views of that ordinance. They believe in a real presence of their Saviour in the Eucharist; they believe that the intelligent and pious communicant discerns there the Lord's body; they believe that such, in partaking of the ordinance, partakes of Christ; and they observe it with a view to a personal realization of this privilege, desiring that Christ may be "formed in them the hope of glory." But they do not expect that this is to be obtained by the mere physical act of eating the bread and drinking the wine. Christ can be formed in us only as He becomes to us an object of thought; only as we represent Him to our consciousness as He is made known to us in Holy Scripture; only as we realize Him as the God-man who hath taken away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, and who lives and reigns to secure and complete the salvation of all who put their trust in Him; only as He is to us an object of adoration, trust, and confidence, from our seeing in Him not only an embodiment of all excellence and beauty, but also, and chiefly, the manifestation of God in the flesh, the indwelling of the fulness of the Godhead bodily, the great High Priest who can appear in the presence of God for us, and yet is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, having been in all points tried as we are, yet without sin.* Thus viewed, the Saviour comes nigh to His people's hearts, is seen by them to be altogether precious, is desired by them and confided in by them with all their soul, and so comes to be in them as a mighty energizing power for their spiritual life. But all this rests on the assured belief that He is indeed very God and very man. Deny either position, and the whole effect which the Eucharist is thus believed to have in bringing the soul into fellowship with Christ vanishes. What, I again ask, is there in such a view of that ordinance to induce forgetfulness of or indifference to the fact of our Lord's Incarnation?

But it is alleged that the evidence of facts is against us, that history shows that where the corporal presence in the Sacrament is denied there has always manifested itself a tendency towards humanitarian views of our Lord's Person. "History,"

* Heb. ii. 17; iv. 15.

THE INCARNATION.

says Canon Liddon, "illustrates the tendency to humanitarian declension even in cases where sacramental belief, although imperfect, has been far nearer to the truth than is the bare naturalism of Zwingli. Many English Presbyterian congregations, founded by men who fell away from the Church in the seventeenth century,* were during the eighteenth absorbed into Arianism or Socinianism. The pulpit and the chair of Calvin are now filled by men who have, alas! much more in common with the Racovian catechism than with the positive elements of the Institutes."†

It must have been in some moment of strange obliviousness that Mr. Liddon penned these sentences. The bar of history is the very last to which he should have carried his appeal, if he had wished a verdict in his favour.

In regard to the Presbyterians of England, the case stands thus. Of between one and two thousand congregations formed under pastors ejected from the Church of England, about one hundred and fifty are now in connexion with the Unitarians. All the rest have remained orthodox, and are now connected either with the Scotch Presbyterian Churches or the Congregationalists. Of those that lapsed into Unitarianism, many of the members retained their orthodox views, and out of these new congregations were formed which have handed down orthodox beliefs to the present day.‡ There are besides numerous congregations which have grown out of these, and of those older congregations that retained their orthodoxy. Note has also to be taken of the Scotch Presbyterian Churches, with which the early English Presbyterian Churches were from the first in close communion, all of which are steadfastly Trinitarian, while none of them hold the doctrine of the corporal presence in the Eucharist. Now these orthodox Presbyterian and Congregationalist congregations amount to more than six thousand for

* This is Mr. Liddon's way of stating that many of the best, most learned, and most devoted ministers of the Church of England were violently extruded from her communion, and deprived of their livings, because they could not conscientiously observe certain ceremonies or conform to certain usages.

† *Bampton Lecture*, p. 483-4, 2nd edit.

‡ See the copious and exhaustive work of Mr. T. S. James, entitled *The History of the Litigation and Legislation respecting Presbyterian Chapels and Churches in England and Ireland between 1816 and 1849*. Lond. 1867.

THE INCARNATION.

the whole kingdom ; so that, tried by Mr. Liddon's own test, the tendency of what he calls "imperfect sacramental belief" to lead to Unitarianism, is shown to be immensely less than its tendency to preserve orthodoxy. The balance of the evidence against Mr. Liddon's position is at least as forty to one.

The truth is, it is absurd to connect the two as cause and effect, either on the one side or the other. The defection of the few from orthodoxy was as little due to their sacramental beliefs as was the continued orthodoxy of those who remained steadfast in the faith. Mr. Liddon has in fact here fallen into the shallowest of all fallacies—that of "*post hoc ergo propter hoc*."

With respect to the Church of Calvin, it must be confessed with sorrow that at one time it had to a great extent gone over to Unitarianism or Rationalism ; but this it could be easily shown had nothing to do with the opinions held by Calvin and his associates on sacramental efficacy ; and happily now there is an extending return to orthodox tenets, without any approximation to such sacramental beliefs as Mr. Liddon approves. But let him make what he can of the case of the Genevan Church : what will he make, I would ask on the other side, of the Church of Luther ? No Church, outside that of Rome, holds so prominently the dogma of the corporal presence of the Lord in the Eucharist ; and no Church has so far and so widely departed from orthodoxy as the Lutheran. Will Mr. Liddon apply his "*propter hoc*" here ? If not, is it not evident that it was something else than sound reason which led him to the argument he has advanced from the case of the English Presbyterians ?

But it has been argued that the fact of the Incarnation, if truly believed, almost necessitates a belief in the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper. Christ, it is said, is God-man, and where He is present it is as God-man He is present ; for to say He is present as God, and not as man, is to divide the two natures, which in Him are inseparably united. But if He is present as man, He must be present in body ; and as this is a presence external to us, it can only be by an external act such as takes place when the elements of bread and wine which are declared to be His body, are partaken of by the

THE INCARNATION.

communicant, that men can become partakers of Him. Therefore, it is argued, the dogma of the corporal presence is so closely related to the fact of the Incarnation, that if it may not be said the rejection of the former leads to the denial of the latter, it must nevertheless be said that the two naturally go together, and the belief of the one naturally confirms the belief of the other. This is substantially the argument of Brentius, who has written on this question with much ability,* and it is repeated, with different degrees of force and clearness, by some later writers connected with the Anglican Church.† Into the whole question of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, it is no part of my present business to enter. I confine myself to the bearing of the argument above stated on the connexion between the Incarnation and the Corporal Presence.

Now the question here is not as to the presence of Christ being the presence of the God-man; this is at once conceded; wherever Christ is, there He is as God in the flesh. The only question is as to the way in which He is thus present. Is it a presence locally or a presence spiritually—a presence so as to be the object of sense, or a presence so as to exert an influence over the spirit of the communicant? The former cannot be maintained except on the ground of transubstantiation; for the only body perceptible by the senses is the bread and the wine, and unless the body and blood of Christ are in them, they are not there locally. But if the body of the Lord is not there locally and sensibly, in what other way can it be there but as an object of faith and a source of spiritual efficacy? This latter is what we affirm. We believe that the God-man is present in the Eucharist; we believe that He presents Himself to all true communicants as their divine-human Saviour, whose body was wounded and whose blood was shed as a propitiation for sins; and to such we believe He communicates Himself in all His sanctifying, comforting, and sustaining grace. To us, therefore,

* *De Personali Unione Duarum Naturarum in Christo . . . qua vera Corporis et Sanguinis Christi praesentia in Coena explicata est et confirmata.* Tubing. 1561.

† See *Tracts for the Day*, edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley, M.A. Tr. 5 and Tr. 8. Lond. 1868.

THE INCARNATION.

in the Lord's Supper there is a real presence of the God-man, and therefore a constant presentation to the soul, not in a merely speculative way, but in its practical bearing on our own personal interest, as men in Christ, of the fact of the Incarnation. What more convincing sense of this could a belief in a mysterious, undefinable, physically impossible corporal presence convey?

Further, when it is said that it is only by an outward act that Christ as present can be apprehended, it seems to be forgotten that it is not in the sacrament alone that He is present. He has promised to be with His Church always to the end of the world; He has declared that if any man love Him and keep His words He will come and manifest Himself to him, and make His abode with him; and He has assured His people that wherever two or three are gathered together in His name there He is in the midst of them.* On the ground of these declarations, His people expect and pray for His presence on all their occasions of joy or of sorrow, of waiting or of worship, of enterprise or of endurance; and what they thus expect and ask, He fails not to grant. They thus may have communion with Him at all times, and without the intervention of any outward symbol or act. Obviously, therefore, this is not *necessary* to their realizing His presence, and apprehending Him so as to receive grace from Him according to their need. The elements in the Eucharist have an important end, because, in accordance with a well-known psychological law,† they by an appeal to the senses help the mind more vividly to conceive, and more fully to realize, invisible objects; but they are not absolutely necessary to our discerning the Lord's body, or our partaking of Him.

Whilst, then, we cherish the belief that our blessed Lord is really present in the ordinance which is observed in remembrance of Him, and is there to bless and feed His people, we see no advantage that is gained for this by supposing that He is present bodily. Rather do we dread the effect of such a supposition in turning away the mind of the communicant

* Matt. xxviii. 20; John xiv. 21, 23; Matt. xviii. 20.

† See Stewart's *Philosophy of the Human Mind*, ch. v., Pt. 1, § 1, vol. i., p. 279 ff; Brown's *Lectures on the Philosophy of the Mind*, Lect. 38, vol. iii., p. 289.

THE INCARNATION.

from that spiritual communion with the Saviour which alone is possible for him, and which alone really profits, to the vain expectation of some benefit from the physical operation of the mere elements. The true idea of Christ's presence is that in virtue of His having all power given to Him in heaven and on earth, He is with His people to exert on them that power for their spiritual health and comfort. In all His gifts He gives Himself to His believing people, so that they can say with the apostle, "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."* This is their present privilege: "because He lives, they live also;"† and they anticipate with joy, amid the conflicts and trials of earth, that glorious advent when "He who is their life shall appear, and they also shall appear with Him in glory."‡ Then shall they see His face; then shall they behold His glory;§ and then, in the full fruition of His presence, shall they be blessed for ever.

* Gal. ii. 20. See Martensen, *Dogmatik*, § 179.

† John xiv. 19.

‡ Col. iii. 4.

§ Rev. xxii. 4; John xvii. 24.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

THERE is a mighty magic in names. "The name of the Lord is a strong tower." "The name of Jesus Christ" is a compendium of the Gospel. The name of "Christian," whether it be regarded as a symbol of scorn, or a title to honour, is shunned or claimed with corresponding eagerness. The name of Catholic is supposed to mean so much, to contain such comprehensive blessing, such breadth of view, such strength of love and virtue, that it is assumed alike by the dogmatist, the sceptic, the bigot, and the universalist. The claim to appropriate and to take shelter under such a personal designation as Christian or Catholic, is as a consequence often bitterly resented by those who think that they have established a prescriptive right to monopolize these excellences and advantages. Thus, Trinitarians have refused the name of Christian to many who have declared with passionate zeal that they are the disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ, and Rome and Constantinople have repudiated one another's claim to the name of Catholic. Both Rome and Constantinople have ignored the assumption by the Anglican communion of any such designation, while multitudes of Anglicans, in virtue of certain ecclesiastical similarities to other episcopally officered communities, treat with disdain the claim to the name of Catholic put forth by Churches which, while they make no pretence to so-called Apostolic succession, show unquestionable signs that they have received the Spirit of Christ. It is, without doubt, a vexatious thing when those who are endeavouring to refute the ideas which we mean to convey by certain hallowed phraseology, persist in using our terms in a new

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

sense, and in one that we conceive to be self-imposed and delusive. Vehement indignation has been expressed on the part of orthodox believers, when by Arian, or Nestorian, or Humanitarian, the term Divinity of Christ has been adopted with approval. Orthodoxy has exclaimed, "We will have neither Pantheism, nor Polytheism, nor sentimental philosophy vamped up as Christianity," and it has preferred to abandon the mere phrase to the enemy, rather than to relinquish the deeper, grander reality which was once conveyed by the sublime formula.

When German philosophers tell us that "justification by faith" is only a Semitic phrase for "moral personal self-responsibility," or when the spiritual scepticism of our own day takes pleasure in adopting the most unctuous phraseology of the biblical or pietistic school, evangelical theologians feel to a certain extent outraged, and repudiate the religious experience of the doubters as "moonshine," and their interpretation of the terms in question as little better than blasphemy. The procedure, nevertheless, cannot be arrested. It is a law of human affairs as conspicuous in politics and philosophy as in theology. Neither the Church nor the world will be cured of it. The Church has been especially guilty of the process of name-snatching. Clemens Alexandrinus spent much of his meditative life in trying to establish and adopt the true *Gnosis*. The Church derives the idea of a canon of Scripture from one set of heretics, and that of creeds and formularies from others. To go still further back: the prominent aim of the Epistle to the Hebrews was to show to Hebrew Christians that Gentile believers have an altar, a priesthood, a prophetism, a temple, a Sabbath, and a great High Priest, and that Christians can put into these words, these significant names, a meaning which they never possessed so long as they were limited to Jewish conceptions and an Israelitish ideal.

Moreover, the process has been a healthy one. It has put the sacred names and words themselves into a fiery crucible, and much dross has thus been purged away from them. It has often been seen that words have been mere counters, without any just significance to those who have played with them, while in the freedom of the soul's thought, the right value of the

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

words themselves has been transferred to those who have made a nobler use of them. Sometimes it has turned out that those who were guarding their name or term without intelligence or profit, have become enlightened as to its true meaning, and have all unconsciously been the conservers of an idea, a motive force, a sublime reality, in their dimly comprehended phraseology. The fairy fan would fold into so small a compass that it might be concealed about the person, but when opened it would expand sufficiently to shield a vast army from the scorching rays of the sun; so there are theological terms which have for ages been as useless as stones of the brook, or the burnt ashes of a furnace, which have served as rude weapons of offence, or have lain idle in the armoury of God, but which, when suddenly the hand of His providence has touched them, have proved to be full of latent energy, of light, and power, and consolation unutterable. Treasures hid in the sand, memorials of a bygone age, rough jewels of unknown price, mummied seeds of strange fertility in the hands of men who did not know their value, they have come forth from their obscurity; and to the vexation of those who have had to relinquish their exclusive ownership, they have offered themselves to the world. The phrase "Holy Catholic Church" is one of these divine treasures the full value and blessedness of which is but little appreciated by many who have claimed the exclusive right to appropriate it. The men who have treasured this sublime conception with the most laudable enthusiasm have been accustomed to regard themselves as the special recipients of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. Their faith is to them a supernatural effluence of the Almighty, a monopoly of grace. They do not altogether refuse to credit others who are beyond the pale of their own community with the possession of any faith or any grace, but these are so diminutive and inchoate as to be almost worthless, and are only of value as they may lead the way to a recognition of the supremacy and divinity of their own communion, or what they call "the true Church."

We bless God that such a magnificent idea ever dawned on the human understanding; we grant that it does require great faith to conceive, embrace, and ever to hold fast this thought as it is represented by many of these fellow-Christians of ours.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

But it requires much greater faith and higher grace to conceive, or to "see the kingdom of God" in all its majesty, splendour, and activities, to discern with something more comprehensive, more penetrating than a clergy-list or calendar the boundaries of the Holy Catholic Church throughout the world, for "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." It required great faith and grace to believe that God did in very deed dwell between the cherubim, and make a dwelling-place of Zion, to see Him in the wearisome ritual of the temple service, in the bloody rites and barbaric pomp of Jerusalem; but it required much more faith in a Jew to believe that in the upper chamber there was One greater than the temple, to see in the crucified and dying man the King of kings, to discern in the blood of Calvary the sacrifice once offered to bear the sins of the world. It may require at the present hour great faith and grace to believe in a visible organization of disciples as the true temple of God, and the real body of the Christ; but it involves a higher exercise of faith, a more expansive and Christlike charity, to stretch out beyond the visible order—the golden courts of the temple—to go forth beyond the odour of the incense and the sound of the silver trumpets, beyond the echoes of the anthem and the limits of the tangible banquet that is spread, and there, where there is nothing to be seen or heard, or handled or tasted, that may assist the imagination, still to feel that we are within the temple area, and to "endure as seeing Him that is invisible."

It may require much faith to accept as true, and much grace to live upon the knowledge, that a society—sacramentally generated and nourished by human processes which are nevertheless the means for the communication of divine grace—is the body of Christ, to see something supernatural in the constitution and propagation of this society, and to feel that special blessings are the monopoly of those who form a part of this society. But it surely requires a higher exercise of faith to see the supernatural and divine influence and presence wherever two or three are met together in the Name of Christ, to have the eye of the soul open to all the operations of the Holy Spirit in our humanity; even to see the kingdom of God in individuals and in societies that do not consciously or

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

formally recognize it themselves. The "notes" of the Christian life, and of the true Church, are more numerous and more subtle than any of our creeds, our hierarchies, our symbolical books, or our respectable institutions may be disposed to admit.

The recent action of the Church of Rome, and the extreme agitation in Christian and philosophic minds as to the nature and functions of the Catholic Church, force every thoughtful man to ask the question, "What is the Church of Christ?" Perhaps more than at any former period we are able dispassionately to inquire whether the conception of the Church revolves around an ascertained mass of dogmatical propositions touching historical, or philosophical, or transcendental truths, or around the truths, the facts themselves; whether "the Church" involves the notion of a supernatural Presence attested to the senses and reason by natural processes and by sufficient evidence, or the notion of a Presence of God which sets at nought all the evidence to which our ordinary faculties are amenable, and falls back on traditionary customs which date up to an age before science can be said to have been born. It is a question of supreme importance whether the Church is a society which cannot develop itself without a central, human, infallible authority such as is competent even now to impose an "imperative" upon the conscience; or whether, on the other hand, it is not an indisputable fact that "the Church" has gone on triumphantly developing itself and permeating all human society independently of the Sacramental assistance which is thought by many to be indispensable. We are compelled to inquire whether "the Church" implies as an integral element of its existence a high organization, an elaborate hierarchy, and visible corporeity, in order to embody and conserve its eternal energy; or whether these elements are separable accidents: whether "the true Church" must be necessarily patent to the observation of mankind, or whether it can be discerned only by the spiritual eye of the regenerated. It is a still more momentous inquiry whether the Church of God can be perpetuated by physical manipulation; whether it is enlarged, nourished, and governed by ritual and mystery which appeal rather to the imagination than to the understanding; or whether it is propagated and expanded exclusively by the diffusion of the Spirit

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

of Christ, by the permeation of all social, national, and human relationships with the power of the Holy Ghost.

We cannot escape from the inquiry, Is the grace of God mainly, primarily communicated by what are called sacramental acts, or does it reach the nature of man chiefly by intellectual and emotional channels? Is the grace of God diffused through the sacramental processes of a particular caste of individuals, or can the heart of man approach and receive it by the operation of the truth, by whomsoever or whatsoever means that truth is conveyed? A child is born into this sinful world with a nature which is itself injured and depraved; the heart of God is yearning over that child, and the grace of God can implant within it new and divine life, can fit it for voluntary communion with Himself, make it partake of the divine nature, and cause it to escape the corruption that is in the world. That which calls itself "the true Church" forces us to ask, from Holy Scripture and common sense, whether this divine life is necessarily communicated by physical processes, and by actions that are beyond the limits of that child's consciousness, or whether the essence of the entire process is not one which touches the intelligence, affects the emotions, and directs the will. Granting the importance and even the indispensable quality and continuous validity of sacramental observances,—is the essence of their operation in the region of the material, or in that of the spiritual? Do sacraments affect the nature through the intelligence, or through nervous, cutaneous, or gastric conditions? Is a baptized child—*apart* from the social, parental, educational, ecclesiastical influences of which its baptism is the witness—more likely, more certain to have received the grace of God, in any sense whatever, than an unbaptized child which is from the first exposed to the gracious influences of the Christian home, of the Holy Scripture, of the example of saintly men, and the practical service of the family of God? Is a man who has lived all his life from his baptism in sin and alienation from God in a higher position of grace because he receives the last offices of the Church, than one who without any sacramental initiation into the covenant, or any communion with "the true Church," is yet alive unto God, glows with faith and hope, burns with love to Christ, over-

comes the world, intelligently triumphs over death, and is persuaded that nothing can separate him from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord?

There are other and allied questions of intense interest which are perpetually forcing themselves on our attention. The historic continuity of certain societies of Christians from early, from apostolic, or sub-apostolic times, is insisted upon by many rival claimants. Alexandria and Edessa, Athens and Constantinople, contest the palm of antiquity with Rome and Iona. Christian societies on the coast of Malabar, and in the fastnesses of the Alps, as well as the present representatives of the archiepiscopal thrones of Paulinus and Augustine, contend with Copts, Armenians, and Nestorians for this historic continuity. The question arises, Is there anything really precious or to be sought after in this genealogical identity with an obscure and disfigured past? Is it worth the trouble to establish or dispute any of these claims? There were days when hereditary dignities and aristocratic lineage were the channels in which all the powers of this world were accustomed to flow, when the divine right of kings to rule was an accepted principle of human affairs, and when blue blood, royal alliance, and dynastic cliques ruled the world. In Oriental countries, where more is thought of caste or of lineage than of virtue or intelligence, it might be comprehensible that such historic continuity of certain societies should carry some weight with it, and recommend itself to the adhesion of mankind; but the world is rapidly outgrowing the obvious superstition. It cannot stand the fiery test, the aquafortis of modern thought. The oldest thrones have tottered to the dust, the hereditary principle of government is everywhere giving way to the natural spontaneous forces of a world which is always young. A man does not rule either armies, parliaments, or nations because he has a proud lineage and a burdensome title. We still play with these baubles, they are our adornment, they are not our strength. The title-deeds of the Kings and Kaisers of the future will not be dusty parchments, but practical wisdom, kingly sagacity, and God-given power to rule. "The powers that be are ordained of God." The authority of the civil throne is a divine ordinance; the king and the minister

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

rule by God-given right; but how is the right conferred? Is it by the patent of nobility, by an historic continuity, or a long lineage reaching back into feudal times? Would or could we even *debate* now—in aristocratic England—the validity of the claim of the House of Brunswick to the throne of these realms? In the great nations of the West and the South, is not personal merit the only claim to power or precedence? If it were now proved to demonstration that a dozen bar-sinisters could be drawn over the royal escutcheon, would the loyalty of England suffer any diminution? Does it not rest on something deeper?

Hence the question is one of vital importance, Has the historic continuity of the Church of Rome with the Church of the Catacombs anything whatever to do with its claim to our respect, apart from its fitness to do for this nineteenth century what the Church of the first three centuries did for them?

The present attitude of the ANGLICAN CHURCH is most instructive, and forces us to ask the question, "What is the Church?" Every section, party, and "tendency" in that Church gives us a different answer, and reminds us of the relief which Dr. J. H. Newman says he experienced when, escaping from its fellowship into the arms of his true mother, he found that he had no longer to invent an ideal Church, or modify a theory about the Church, but simply to accept an obvious fact.*

The High Church section, or "traditional† tendency" in the Church of England, cannot be said to be homogeneous. Many of its adherents maintain that the society at present called the Church of England stands in historic relation with the Church founded in these realms in Anglo-Saxon times. They believe in it as one of the most venerable and deeply-rooted institutions of the nation. They point, with conscious elation, to its property, its connection with the Crown, and Parliament, and people, as well as to its ecclesiastical pedigree. They are eager to show that they derive their orders, charters, and authorities from ancient times. Many Nonconformists even are ready to concede that what an aristocracy is among the various subdi-

* "Apologia, pro vita sua," App. p. 24.

† See Dr. Weir's Essay in "The Church and the Age," p. 475.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

visions of English society, that is the Anglican Church among the so-called Churches of England. High-Churchmen take, however, very different views of the great change which came over the Church in the sixteenth century. To some of them the Anglican Church represents the condition of Catholicity before the great schism between the East and the West. It classes itself with the Greek Church, glories in an apostolicity independent of Rome, and repudiates the vices and errors of the Papal supremacy. There are others who try to persuade themselves that they still form an integral part of a much larger and wider organization. It does not appear to trouble or confound the latter that Rome is inexorable in her demands, that she never condescends even to conceive it possible that Anglican orders could be apostolic or Catholic, or to dream that within the Anglican communion there can be any participation in the body and blood of the Lord. This section of the Anglican communion speak of their fellowship with the Western Church as though it were an undoubted reality. Every ambitious phrase minted in the ecclesiastical workshops of the middle ages is freely used and boldly applied to the orders and sacraments of the Anglican community.

Again, High-Churchmen take very different estimates of the work of the Reformation in England. One section glories in it as a blessed deliverance from the unnatural and denationalizing supremacy of Rome. It maintains that the continuity of the Church was never broken by the work of Henry and Elizabeth, of Wolsey, of Cranmer, or of Parker,—that the change and modification of ritual, the renunciation of certain dogmas, the repudiation of numberless abuses, even the cessation of relations with the Roman See, left the entire body of the Church intact, and that the divine sanction, based upon its having been a part of the universal Church, is not withdrawn by a formal repudiation of the original source of that sanction.* Other members of the High Church party denounce and vilify the Reformation as a swindle and a curse to England—using, in fact, all the strong language of Romish partizans in their

* Dr. Hook, in "The Church and the Age," pp. 15, 27; "Lives of Abps. of Canterbury," vol. vi., pp. 32—60; Mr. Blunt, "The Reformation of the Church of England," chap. i.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

repudiation of every benefit which Englishmen purchased at the fearful price of Smithfield martyrdoms. Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer are compared with the most audacious, unprincipled, and bloodthirsty monsters of the Reign of Terror. A powerful party strive to reproduce the peculiar ritual, ceremonial, and phraseology of the Romish Doctors, as to worship, dogma, and discipline. The name of Protestant stinks in their nostrils. The immaculate conception, and the cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the necessity of confession to an apostolically ordained priest, the worship of saints, angels, and relics, the divine honours paid to the consecrated Bread, the whole method of dealing with the Eucharist as the manifestation of God, all the functions of the priesthood, the multiplication of the sacraments, have been carried as far as it is possible, in order to ensure a close proximity and resemblance to the usages of the Western Church.*

There are members of both sections who go yet farther, and endeavour to effect what is termed the reunion of Christendom. No purpose in itself could be more worthy or sublime than to bring the severed branches of Christ's Holy Catholic Church into a real fellowship—one which should end in hushing their war-cries, and breaking through or melting down the icy crust of culpable indifference, reserve, and dislike under which Christian love has been frozen into torpor, and the very name of Christian has become a synonym for enmity, narrowness, and heartburning. It seems to us strangely sad that holy men whose hearts are large enough to see the Church of Christ, the kingdom of God, in the Oriental communities, and who have laid themselves out for possible Christian intercommunion with Greek and Roman Churches, should treat with apparent disdain the vast Christian communities in the Old and New World which have been displaying, over a period as long as the Reformed Anglican Church can claim to have had any existence, the powers and energies of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

It is instructive, however. "The Holy Catholic Church," as defined by the Reunion party, is limited to the communities which can, by fair or unfair process, by plausible pretence or

* "The Femall Glorie;" "Tracts for the Day;" "The Ritual of the Altar;" "Four Cardinal Virtues," etc. Edited by Rev. Orby Shipley.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

doubtful manœuvre, vindicate to themselves a continuity of episcopal order from the old Catholic times. The "note" of the true Church—without which Christian life, orthodox faith, zeal for Christ, missionary energy, and martyrlike force of conscience are all of no avail—is this same apostolic succession. The apostolic succession, it is true, may develop itself in the humbling vagaries of the East, in the bigotry, deception, arrogance, and cruelty of Jesuitical intrigue, in the fantastic puerilities of Greek orthodoxy, or even of Abyssinian barbarism; while, on the other hand, the power of the Spirit of God may produce, without the help of "apostolic order," the Free Church life of New England, the pietism of Germany, Moravian and Waldensian zeal and self-sacrifice, to say nothing of the energies of Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, and Methodism throughout Great and Greater Britain;—and yet, nothing daunted by the astounding paradox, the only hope for Christendom cherished by Reunionists is one which shall include the former in and exclude the latter from their ideal of the Holy Catholic Church. At the same time this is not without deep interest to us. The main principle for which we plead is virtually admitted in the programme and platform of the Reunion. There is something greater than a common organization, or than the formation of a visible unity of which they are mutually conscious. Choice spirits there must be in the three great communions of Rome, Constantinople, and Canterbury, who do overleap the barriers of their sect. Though they are mutually disowned by the authorities of their respective Churches, and though these Churches as communities anathematize each other, and demand impossible concessions as the price of intercommunion, the ideal of the Holy Catholic Church is wider and nobler than the realization of it in any one of these organizations. A potent leaven is this sentiment, and it may leaven the whole lump. As a single grain of mustard-seed is this ideal; but if it take deep root in men's minds, it will enlarge and dignify the conception of the Church itself, and will revolutionize not only the Church of Rome, but all Churches which are imitating her dogmatism and exclusiveness.

The Broad Church party, the "rationalizing tendency" which has always been present in the Church of England, does

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

not restrict the Holy Catholic Church to the national system, of which it speaks in exalted terms. It hardly professes that there is anything more supernatural or divine in the framework of the *Church* of England than is to be found in the *State* of England, or that any special grace denied to the Non-conformist or Presbyterian is conferred by communion at her altars. It rejoices rather in the abundant liberty which a national institution affords to men of very varied sentiments to hold and propagate their ideas under cover of the subscription to certain formularies, which is understood to be of the loosest possible obligation. The dispassionate judgment of law courts, equity judges, and Lord Chancellors has often been moved to characterize the divergency of individuals from the sense of the formularies. The result has proved that those formularies leave room for the most opposite and contradictory opinions on such questions as the efficacy of baptism, the authority of Scripture, the future life, the person of the Lord, and His presence in the Eucharist. The ultimate effect of the *Purchas* and *Voysey* judgments can hardly yet be determined. Probably if the questions were fairly tried, belief in even the royal supremacy, in the divine order of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, or in the priestly character of the Christian ministry, would be declared to be not essential to membership or ministry in the Anglican communion. The whole question of the Catholic Church, in the opinion of this important, learned, and liberal section of the Established Church, resolves itself into one of speculative opinion and practical arrangement. It certainly is not in any sense limited by the idea that one type of special organization is divine, and that other organizations, aiming at the same general result, are not divine. Men who are outside of that communion are continually challenged to entertain ideas as comprehensive and charitable as those put forth by this section of the Church; to relinquish the dreams they may entertain of having realized a divine society, or the germs of it; to cease to follow the *ignis fatuus* of a spiritual rule in the Church, which, according to Dean Stanley, is far more worldly and less religious than that which is laid down by the impartial law court or the national legislature of a Christian people. I am not aware that I differ on the nature and extent of the Holy

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Catholic Church from those to whom I refer, however unsatisfactory may seem to me their method of realizing on earth the ideal of a divine community of faithful men.

The Evangelical section or "Scriptural tendency" of the Anglican Church, in its entire principle as to the method by which a soul is justified before God, and in the emphasis it places on personal and spiritual union with Christ, lays the broadest foundation for large and noble views of the Universal Church, though the breadth and splendour of the conception is somewhat arrested by the narrowness that can refuse the privileges of Christian fellowship to those who may be conscientiously unable to co-operate practically and constantly with their Church in its modes of worship and sacramental service.

In the remarks I have to offer, I do not intend to enter the lists either with the Presbyterian or with the Evangelical Anglican as to the nature of the Catholic Church. It is my firm conviction that the differences that separate us are of infinitesimal importance by the side of those principles in which we entirely agree.

It is not intended in this paper to discuss afresh the points of divergence raised between warring Churches or battling creeds; but rather to call attention to the presence of facts which ought never to be lost sight of. I shall not state, much less re-open here, the controversies between Rome and Geneva, Rome and Canterbury, Rome and Constantinople. There is no need to cite the rival theories of the Congregationalist, Presbyterian, or Episcopalian, to argue for or against a municipal, national, or oecumenical conception of a visible Ecclesia, or to attempt to determine whether a Christian Society needs for its government an unbroken tradition or succession of Bishops, the consent of all Christians in council assembled, or the authority of the civil magistrate; nor shall I argue that it is complete in itself a dwelling-place of God, protected by a venerable and eternal law, and assured by the witness of the Holy Ghost of the presence and presidency of the Lord Jesus Christ.

It is not necessary to discuss with the heads of the Free Church of Scotland, with the Encyclical of Pius IX., with Dr.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Arnold or with Mr. Maurice, with Dean Stanley or Dean Hook, the question of Establishments of Religion. The conception of the Holy Catholic Church towers above all ecclesiastical theories or political discussions. When the eye is filled with its glory, it is almost impossible to discern the rival and eager parties, who often prove, by their contention for an exclusive right to a place in this sublime association, that they all in their heart of hearts possess and love most fervently that which is made the pretext for their reciprocal disavowals. We have recently been soothed by the noble declaration of one of the Anglican Bishops, whose election to the bench produced bitter opposition. He said, in effect, that the severe words and uncompromising condemnations of which he had been the object, proceeded, according to his belief, from deep love to the Lord Jesus Christ, and that the sign of that love and jealousy for His Holy Name was a powerful bond of union for him with those who had taken a certain course against himself. He loved his enemies, and called them his friends, for the love to Christ which had been evinced in their opposition to himself. There was marvellous healing in that avowal. Few things more Christlike have ever been said. Still, if not said, have they never been felt? Has not religious persecution itself evoked strong bonds of fellowship between those whom propositions, and ceremonies, and mutual misunderstanding have driven into the position of deadly foes? Has not the passionless judge of the "Holy Inquisition" sometimes revealed a sublime jealousy for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, which has excited the love and provoked the sympathy of his victim? There is an electric thrill which circulates from camp to camp of seeming foes. There is a unity underlying their differences which is becoming a sentiment, and which will become a passion, and develop into a principle, and at length fulfil the prayer of the Divine Lord, "that they all might be ONE, even as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee; that they may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."

The nineteenth century has done much to reveal to the world the existence of a Christendom which is wider than the organization that for many centuries was practically conterminous

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

with it. There are facts of human experience and principles of divine life which transcend all systems, which cannot be defined by any set of dogmatical propositions, and which are neither embodied nor embraced in any national establishment of Christian teachers. There is a kingdom of Christ which is not included in any one community of Christians, nor in any section of similarly constituted communities, nor in the entire range of all so-called Churches taken together. Whether men like it or not, Christendom is a fact—a realized fact.

There was a time when it was impossible for the divine life to take any new form, or persist in any social expression of it, that was not submissive to the Græco-Roman type of dogma and discipline. The shadow and ghost of the Imperial system haunted all the temple of the living God. Despotism, personal government, unbending authority, forged links that the free spirit could not break. All effort to constitute a society upon Christian principle beyond this Imperial *régime* was met by superior power, and held in check, if not violently shattered. We see the unchristian idea dawning in the writings of the Greek Fathers, and we find the Western Bishops, Cyprian and Augustine, led on by circumstances to give emphatic and abundant testimony to the principle that beyond the visible society which they were pleased to identify with the Catholic Church, there was neither salvation nor life, neither the Fatherhood of God, nor the redemption of Christ.* Feudalism led the way to some sectional and national independence of the central authority, but the Europe of to-day still shows the mark of the ancient *régime* upon all its institutions. All the societies and laws of Europe came into existence amid the memories and under the prestige of the Catholic system, with the struggling forms of individual, social, and national life, often in fierce antagonism with the central power, and often vainly swelling themselves to ape the majesty and rival the associations of the so-called Catholic Church. "You are but of yesterday, and know nothing," is the reiterated cry of the defenders of the Papacy. It is true that the mighty deeds of European history, and the Christian life in Europe,—those which shed conspicuous lustre upon, and lend their mystic charm

* Cypriani Opp. De unitate Ecclesiæ, especially §§ iv.—viii.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

to the origins of nations,—were identified with organized Christianity. But the world is growing. The triumphs of Christianity over Oriental theocracies and superstitions, and over the savage barbarism of the isles of the Pacific, are not now confined to the emissaries of any particular Church. From Greenland to Madagascar, from the coast of Guinea to the Yellow Seas, from Tinivelly to the Caucasus, may be seen numberless proofs of the power of unfettered Christianity, and of the grace of the living God to change and renew the heart of man, to originate in the bosom of besotted or refined paganism the germ of a new life, the Christian institution, the Christian family, in some instances also the Christian State.

More than that, new and great nations are rising into vigorous life, under the tutelage of Christian ideas and free institutions. The golden age and mature development of their activity are yet to be. The old-world prestige of Kaiser or Pontiff has never stifled them, nor crushed their young life. They have already a history of their own. Their literature, their forms of government, their mighty memories, are neither pontifical, nor imperial, nor feudal. The basis of their society is not ecclesiastical. The divine right of kings does not perplex them; the freedom of association and worship is the very air they breathe. In the era of Montanism and Donatism, and again in the early days of the so-called Reformation, the revolt was so violent, and the desire for spiritual freedom so much complicated by folly and crime, that there was colour for the assumption which denied Christianity or Catholicity to heretical bishops or self-willed princes, to the wild orgies of emancipated slaves, or to the countries which repudiated their allegiance to the visible head of organized Christendom. Now, however, nothing but the intoxicating incense of the Vatican can befog the intelligence of Romanists to the fact of a Christendom which is outside their own pale. The old arguments, and threats, and assumptions are set on one side by the irresistible logic of facts. There are nominally Christian nations and societies and communities which are as conspicuous in the world as is the hierarchy of Rome, and as fully charged with the spirit and the law of the kingdom of Christ. If we would

know what the Holy Catholic Church is, we must take facts like these into consideration.

The idea and the term Church has doubtless signified in all times an *association*, a *fellowship*, a *communion* of living men. But the *communion*, though it be the vital element in the idea, has been made so dependent on the *means* used to secure it, that the latter has been actually confounded with the former. The law of the association, the terms of communion, the venerable dogma, or much-loved ritual, or boasted freedom, have been substituted for the *ecclesia* itself.

Two or three positions appear to be worthy of consideration at this point of inquiry.

1. There is a point where the extreme views of Rome and her most severe and dogmatic critics agree, and where the door is opened for something like mutual understanding. Even Rome will not maintain that the true spiritual Church of Christ is conterminous with the organic company of the faithful. It is not merely that Rome lays great emphasis on the fact that tares are sown with the wheat, and grow together until the harvest, pressing the point that the "world" of the parable is the one Church of the living God; but that when pressed hard in Donatist and other disputes, her great Doctors are ready, with Augustine,* to confess that it is not enough to belong to the community, to partake of sacramental privilege, to be a part of the visible body of Christ, without union and participation in the soul of Christ. "We ought not to believe that they are in the body of Christ, which is the Church, because in a bodily manner they participate in the sacraments."† Bellarmine admits that "there are some who belong both to the body and soul of the Church, viz., the truly pious; they may be compared to the living members of the body, although they partake of life in different degrees. Others

* De Unitate Ecclesiæ, August Opp. [Ben. Ed.] § 74. Tom. ix., p. 386. Multi tales sunt in sacramentorum communione cum Ecclesia, et tamen non sunt in Ecclesia. Tom. ix., Lib. v. 38, 39, pp. 159, 160. See also De Baptismate contra Donatistas, Tom. ix., Lib. vi., § 5.

† Contra Litteras Petilianæ, ii. § 247, nec ideo putandi sunt esse in Christi corpore quod est Ecclesia, quia sacramentorum ejus corporaliter participes sunt. See also De Baptismate c. Don. Lib. v. §§ 38, 39, and De Doctrina Christiana, lib. iii. § 45.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

belong to the soul, as catechumens or excommunicated persons, if (as may occur) they have faith alone. Others, lastly, are of the body only; such, namely, as while they have no inward grace, are in outward communion with the Church.”*

2. While Romanist and Protestant have used the term invisible Church, they have differed as to the true limitation of the term. The great ecclesiastics have, *e.g.*, limited the phrase to denote the part of the Church which has passed into the heavens, and therefore is no longer visible on earth,—the *ecclesia triumphans* as distinct from the *ecclesia militans*. Now, without entering here on the violent opposition to the Protestant dogma of the invisible Church of God’s elect and sanctified ones,† it is well to pause for a moment over the essential peculiarities of that part of the Church Catholic which has passed away from the communion and restrictions of earth.

Nothing is more obvious than that this general assembly and Church of the firstborn is beyond the range of human systematization, and owns no obedience to canonical authority, to infallible Pope, or Œcumenical Council. It is not disturbed by the definitions of heresy; it is above the strife of party; it is indifferent to encyclicals of Patriarch or Emperor; it knows nothing of the limitations of word-bound logic. In dropping the garments of the flesh, it has dispensed with those manacles as well as instruments of the spirit called *words*. Truth that is defined by propositions, or limited by carefully exact phraseology, ceases to assume the power so well known and so often balanced in the strife of the schoolmen. The awful, glorious face of truth is unveiled. The spirit is face to face with realities which soar above the definition of Greek particles, and transcend the limits of Latin formularies, into the region

* See Litton—“The Church of Christ, in its Idea, Attributes, and Ministry,” p. 67.

† Article XIX of the Church of England does not mention the invisible Church, but implies by the term “visible” the contradistinction to something invisible. Harold Browne, *expos. of XXXIX Arts.*, p. 453. See Nowell’s Catechism, pp. 171, 172 (Parker Society Edition). Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England, by Thomas Rogers, edition by Rev. J. S. Perowne, p. 164, ff, where the testimony of the Protestant Confessions may be seen quoted. Catechism of the Council of Trent, ques. iv. v. See also, Ed. vi. Liturgy, Catechism, p. 511 (Park. Soc. Ed.).

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

where all dispute about sacraments and orders and discipline must cease to have any interest, save as a memory of the past. The most rigid precisian among us, Catholic or Puritan, has a conception of a Church, of an association of spirits untrammelled by verbal creeds, by venerable establishments, or ancient hierarchies. This blessed society is none the less real though it consists of the men of all times, as well as of all countries and classes. The sweet singer of Israel cannot even be supposed by the inductive theologian to have mastered his latest generalizations. Jeremiah can sing the praises of God with Bernard without their mutual understanding of theological dogmata. The Donatist dispute would have no meaning for Job, or Isaiah, or Ezekiel. They all, with Augustine and Chrysostom, Gregory and Benedict, have risen to a more Catholic fellowship, where they can rejoice and serve together the God of Abraham, and David, and Isaiah. More than that, the one and indivisible fellowship which embraces the successive generations of mighty churchmen and holy martyrs, must spontaneously teach itself strange lessons of charity. Unless the invisible Church in heaven is undergoing perpetual enlightenment from the development of doctrine and discipline in the Church on earth, the communion that is truly Catholic must, on the Catholic hypothesis, be independent of the signs and notes of such catholicity as is allowed on earth.

3. All those who dispute with each other as to the extent or "notes" of the Holy Catholic Church *on earth*, do actually include in their definition many considerations which are significant of a life deeper and grander than the oft-quoted "notes" themselves.

The highest churchman is not so bound by his belief in the validity and importance of the sacramental system as to regard it as absolutely and universally indispensable to salvation, or even to fellowship on earth, with that which he believes to be the body of Christ. However narrow may be the range of his exceptions, however uncomplimentary the ground on which he places them, still the fact that he can make one single exception, establishes a principle of surpassing interest, viz., that the whole sacramental, sacerdotal, and dogmatical system

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

of Catholicism is not the Church of Christ. These forms and ceremonies are not the life itself, but the manifestation of it; they may be *aids* or *buttresses*, the *food* or the *articulation* of a system; but they are not its life; they do not constitute the Holy Catholic Church. They are not absolutely indispensable to the Church on earth; they are certainly not needed by the larger and more strangely varied community that has escaped from the trivialities, the contentions, and the limitations of the flesh.

4. In enumerating the signs, the aids, the witnesses to the existence of the Catholic Church on earth, theological writers have been too apt to limit themselves to the mere formation of earthly societies; to the nature, functions, and variety of the officers needed for the continuance of such societies; and to the maintenance—by enlightened intelligence, or by ignorant acquiescence—of certain metaphysical forms of stating transcendental facts. Controversy and fierce strife have prevailed as to the form of worship, the validity of orders, the nature of sacraments, the wisdom of stating certain profound difficulties of thought in rational or irrational terms, while the most essential features of the unity of the Church are neglected, while the reality of the life itself, of the Church itself, is lost sight of. I propose in the present paper to inquire whether there are no other, no deeper, no wider indications of the existence and vitality of the Holy Catholic Church than those which are furnished by the organizations, the creeds, the establishments that pass under its name.

I am not concerned to deny the *visibility* of this Catholic Church. The question between Rome and the Churches as to the visibility of the one Church has been often argued. The existence of an invisible Church, consisting of those known to God alone, chosen in His wisdom, sanctified by His grace, gathered out of all kingdoms and countries and times, without spot or blemish, redeemed and holy, is a sublime conception. It answers closely to the New Testament idea of "the Church of the firstborn."* The repudiation by Rome of such a conception belongs to ecclesiastical history. Those who have believed in it have sometimes endeavoured to realize in an earthly fellowship

* Eph. iv. 4, v. 25—27; Col. i. 18; Heb. xii. 23; 1 Pet. ii. 2, 5.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

of visible bonds a purity of communion corresponding with its divine original and inner ground. The experiments of the Donatists, of the Reformed Church of Geneva, and of many communities of Puritans and Nonconformists, are full of instruction. It is not intended to state or review the controversy which such communities have maintained with Rome, nor to limit the visible Church to the association or summation of all ecclesiastical organizations, Rome included ; but to maintain the position that there is a *visible Catholic Church* outside, or rather independently of, all so-called communions ; that it moves in a different sphere, and works in more comprehensive and untrammelled lines, than those which any one community, or all communities taken together, can supply.

THE MANIFESTATIONS OF THE DIVINE LIFE IN HUMANITY, IN SOCIETY, and therefore in the RELATIONS SUBSISTING BETWEEN MAN AND MAN, furnish a series of facts of consummate interest and vast extent, to which alone the full conception of the Holy Catholic Church can properly apply. The stupendous victories of Christianity over Heathenism, and over the manners and customs of the ancient world, the vast structure of Catholicism, the consummate order of the monastic system, the hierarchy of East and West, the mighty disintegrating forces of feudalism and nationalism, the birth of modern society, and the existence and activities of all so-called Churches, are all parts of the revelation of this new-born force, this supernatural element leavening our humanity ; but these are only a part of its ways. It is the *life* itself which is HOLY ; it is the life itself which is DIVINE ; it is the life itself, and it alone, which is CATHOLIC.

I assume that there is no question here concerning the fact of the divine life in individual men. All Christians, so-called Catholics included, agree that the human soul is the scene of the highest manifestations of the divine nature. By faith in the truth of God, any human being may become partaker of the divine thought and nature. The incarnation of God realizes the loftiest ideal, sets forth in sublime fruition the hope of every son of man. The absolute and the relative, the eternal and the temporal, have so met in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, that union to Him constitutes a new life in

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

man. The knowledge of Him and of the only true God is life eternal. Out of the corrupted and damaged human nature, the Spirit of God does make a glorious and perfect dwelling for Himself. The passions of the human soul are by this gracious process centred on their legitimate object, the law of God is spontaneously obeyed, man is made willing to fulfil the behests of God, the effects of sin are removed or lifted away from the soul by its reception of that which is the highest expression of the divine righteousness and love, a hunger after righteousness is awakened and then allayed, the most perfect manifestation of the nature of God becomes the object of man's enthusiastic and self-abnegating love, and, under this inspiration, the change in *some* instances is so startling and complete, that "old things" are said to have "passed away, and all things to have become new."

In other cases the working of this life in man produces a change which is not a matter of conscious experience. The new life has supervened upon the old life, before the dawn of active hostility or the development of passive indifference. There has been *regeneration*, but no conscious *repentance*.

Protestantism lays the greatest stress on the *μεταβολή*, on the active, intelligent, conscious side of the process, on the change through which the soul passes experimentally, on the fact that the most marked sphere of the operation of this divine life is where there is an intelligent apprehension of the incarnate God in Christ, when the mind accepts by a free and vigorous act the life, the righteousness, the sacrifice, the triumph, the supremacy of the Lord Jesus, when deliberately choosing life rather than death, it believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, and is saved. The whole burden of divine revelation seems directed to evoke the conscience into activity, and stir the will to "come," and is a comment on the Lord's own account of the matter: "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." Grace is seen developing its highest fruit through consciousness of itself. The most famous terms descriptive of the human side of the divine operation involve the activity of the moral conscience, of the free intelligence, of the spontaneous voluntary power. Every definition of *faith* will include

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

the conscious activity of either mind, or heart, or will,—of two, or of all three combined. From St. Thomas Aquinas to Bishop Bull, from Luther to Swedenborg, from the Council of Trent to the Augsburg Confession, the “Homilies,” and the Westminster Confession, they all indicate this much of agreement. Again: “reconciliation with God” is a phrase without meaning unless the will and the intelligence take part in it. The same may be said of such phrases as “obedience to the will of God,” as the “love of God,” “assurance of hope,” and many others. The appeal of the Law and of the Gospel alike is made to a voluntary and intelligent being, and the fruit of grace is best seen in the spontaneous fellowship and conscious reconciliation of a created will with the supreme will. We are, however, far from saying that there is no grace which works “back of consciousness,” and we should shrink from denying that deep down in the recesses of nature, in the very blood and life of man, before they spring up into character or effloresce into free-will, or have felt the conflict of worldly interests with spiritual destinies, or the hot breath of temptation, or the chill baptism of doubt, or the triumphant tyranny of selfish passion, there are powers of evil and of good, of corruption and of grace, in sub-conscious strife. The New England divinity, which has exercised no inconsiderable influence upon modern thought, as well as the theology of Augustine, Calvin, and Owen, may be said to turn upon this solemn speculation. Beyond this, the theology of the Protestant confessions agrees with the symbols of Rome in admitting to the full the work of grace, the aspects of the renewal and salvation of man, which rise up into the deep purposes and decrees of God, and seem complete in themselves without making demand upon the consciousness of man. More than that, Protestantism ungrudgingly recognizes a host of mighty influences which are beyond the range of conscious individual appreciation. The power of love, and example, and law, the constringency of family bonds, the spirit of a community, of a race, of a generation, of a nation, are not forgotten by those who may take a low estimate of sacramental grace. Possibly the sacramental system simply gives expression to a deeper, wider economy of grace than it professes to recognize. From

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

our point of observation, that system is full of exclusions and limitations, and is a contracted view of the abundant help which God's grace supplies to the soul of man. The high tides of parental love are a ministry of God's grace, whatever be the value or significance of the "baptismal dew." The powers of holy example, Church life, home sanctities, and Christian association are charged with the Holy Spirit. They unquestionably create an atmosphere that is breathed before any conscious recognition of the truth of Christ's kingdom has made faith or repentance possible. The infant, the dependant, the onlooker, the unbeliever, the heathen, have all received a blessing through these consecrated channels before the kingdom of God has even dawned upon the consciousness. The ministry, the fellowship of Christian souls, the silent constant influence of a witness borne by the Christian community and worship to unseen and eternal things, do open the kingdom of God, and throw silken chains and adamantine links round souls, long before they become fully alive to God's grace in them. Many know not that God has healed them. The divine life may make great progress without recognition by the subject of it, just as the physical life and energy may be long at work before there is even complete individuation or any self-reflective energy.

With the history of the development of "the religious idea" brought prominently before them in a thousand ways, it seems impossible for candid men to say that the divine life is limited to so-called Christendom. We have within the last fifty years begun to know something of Oriental speculation, and have received some data on which to form an idea of the past history of the religions of the world. We cannot any longer shut our eyes to the fact that historical men, saints and sages, who have received no discoverable light from the revelation of God in Christ, were not left to the mere teaching of nature. They had an awful reverence for their highest ideal of goodness, and struggled hard after some reconciliation with it. Deist and Pantheist may tell us that these are developments of human nature, and require nothing more than the universal immanent God to account for them. We doubt this *ipse dixit* of the philosophers, while the phenomena of

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Revelation itself furnish us with the true key to these mysteries of life. The history of Persians and Hindus, of Buddhists and Confucianists, of the Socratists, Stoics, and Neo-Platonists, to say nothing of later times, convinces us that God has revealed Himself to and in the higher life, the unworldly sanctity, the sublime self-abnegation, the conformity with conscience and the divine will, which He has conferred upon individuals. Still, with all these exceptions, and notwithstanding this encouraging cycle of fact and experience, it is in Christendom, it is in the ages and communities of Christianity, that the full force of this great influence is most clearly discernible, and one grand peculiarity of it has always been the personal appreciation of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is here that our Lord God has been most clearly seen, and most truly loved, and that the power of His grace has most fully exerted sway over human life. It has been along the lines of certain great traditions, it has been amid the solemn associations originated by Calvary and Pentecost, that we have seen the true light shine.

"Compare," says a well-known writer, "the ancient with the modern world; 'Look on this picture, and on that.' One broad distinction in the characters of men forces itself into prominence. Among all the men of the ancient heathen world, there were scarcely one or two to whom we might venture to apply the epithet 'holy.' In other words, there were not more than one or two, if any, who, besides being virtuous in their actions, were possessed with an enthusiasm of goodness, and, besides abstaining from vice, regarded a vicious thought with horror. Probably no one will deny that in Christian countries this higher-toned goodness, which we call holiness, has existed. Few will maintain that it has been exceedingly rare; perhaps the truth is, that there has scarcely been a town in any Christian country, since the time of Christ, where a century has passed without exhibiting a character of such elevation that his mere presence has shamed the bad and made the good better, and has been felt at times like the presence of God Himself." *

When the divine life has been developed in a human being,

* "Ecce Homo," p. 171.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

when the graft of a divine and nobler order of things has been inserted in the degenerate stock of human nature, and the new leafage, flower, and fruit have been produced, it must not be forgotten that such a man is not an isolated individual, but is one who stands in fundamental relationship with others, and that every one of these relationships has, by his regeneration, been materially modified; some are instantaneously sundered, others are inverted, some are sanctified, others are transfigured.

It would be an impossible task to attempt the enumeration of all the relationships that men sustain to each other, and which exist independently of the supernatural or divine element. Such an attempt would involve a treatise on personal, social, and political ethics. It is, moreover, profoundly difficult to separate these ordinary human relationships from the Christian element and atmosphere that pervade them. The leaven is in the meal, and though often hidden there, its pungent, potent energy is always at work. Therefore I shall, without any further exposition, simply enumerate the fundamental relationships evolved in the formation of the family, in the creation and conflicts of race and tribe, in the division of labour, in the rights of property, in the duties of master and servant, in the obligations of governor and governed, in the constitution of states and nations, and in the sublime conception of humanity as a whole.

There are three different ways in which it is evident that the introduction of a new and divine energy into individual life will affect every one of these relationships, and therefore the very constitution of society. (1) As each man sustains a multitude of different personal relations to others, and may be at one and the same time father and son, master and servant, debtor and creditor, ruler and subject, it is obvious that in every one of these relations, if he passes from the death of nature to the life of grace, his new heart, his Christlike spirit, will modify, revolutionize, and transfigure these relationships. A consecration of ordinary life is not, however, the sum total of the effect produced by the divine life upon society; for (2) those who are alike brought into new and spiritual relations with God, come into new relations with each other. Holy associations for devout fellowship, worship, and service, are

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

abundant and conspicuous. When these have been brought under review, there will remain (3) the marked though indirect effects produced on the world at large by the existence of such a reality as the divine life in man, and the divine life in society.

The following phenomena must therefore be taken into account, if we would summarize the working of the Holy Spirit in our humanity:—

I. The ordinary human relations existing between those who are, and those who are not, the subjects of the divine life, are undergoing entire modification.

II. New and sacred relations—by a law of the spirit of life—arise spontaneously between those who are alike the subjects of the heavenly birth.

III. Indirect results are produced in society at large by the existence in the world of such a sublime reality as the divine life in man.

If we could sum up all these relations and results, we should be face to face with a cycle of forces alike hopeful and potent, capable of originating law, organization, and dogma without end, but, greater than all these things, mastering and outliving them all. I venture to offer a few remarks on each of these considerations, in the hope that I may thus contribute something to the realization of that sublime conception the visible Catholic Church of the living God.

I. *The modification of ordinary human relationships by the new life of individuals.* It is a truism to say that the ordinary human relations of every individual are very numerous. Every human being may be said to sustain, either by turn or simultaneously, both filial and parental relations. Every man is more or less superior and dependent—buyer and seller, teacher and learner, ruler and ruled, giver and receiver. Every man is the member of a family, of a group of families, of a community, of a great number of fellowships and unions and corporations, having more or less of organization in them. Every man may be regarded as a member of a race, or of a nation, with all its corresponding duties, rights, and responsibilities; above all, every individual is a son of man, a representative and exponent of humanity as a whole, and owes his debt to the whole human

race. This bond is, after all, more precious, more charged with meaning, more pregnant with high significance, than that of any corporation or artificial relation whatsoever. The link of humanity binds the children of the Heavenly Father together more than any other; it is sanctified by the Incarnation of the Son of God, and looks on to the redemption which He purchased. It is this which makes it the duty of every man to love his neighbour, and it is this which makes the presence of God in our nature available for the renovation and salvation of mankind.

If it be granted that a man is regenerated, is brought into conscious union with the Lord Jesus Christ, is delivered from the bondage of corruption and admitted to the glorious liberty of the children of God,—if he has “put on the Lord Jesus,” if “perfect love has cast out fear,” and he has presented himself a living sacrifice to God, it is obvious that then every one of the relations of which I have spoken must be modified.

(1) *First of all, in the most fundamental relation he sustains to society; in his domestic affections and subordination he finds himself in a new world.* He looks with new, strange, infinite tenderness upon the mother that bore him, or upon the child at his knee; he pleads, yearns, weeps with a passionate agony, that they may learn his secret, that their eyes also may be opened. But his new love to God is mightier than his natural affection, and may make him unsympathetic or apparently indifferent to the voice of their love. If this new life shall be quickened first of all in an unchristian home, it may kindle a furnace of fire in which the holiest bonds may be sundered. His foes may be those of his own household. The father may rise up against the son, and the son against the father. The holiest passions of our nature may be fairly counteracted by the energy of a still higher passion. “The spirit will lust against the flesh.” A new ideal of human life will be originated by the new love which has begun to possess the soul. If this be not defiled by old associations, and be not coaxed or sneered or trampled down into dust, if the possessor of it retain his integrity, he is often regarded as guilty of ingratitude and folly. His unworldliness, his passive resistance to taunt and blow, his sanctity, chastity, and indifference to personal interests, create

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

a domestic revolution. The history of Christianity and of the divine life when in its missionary stage, when the subject of it has stood alone amid those who could not understand or see the kingdom of God, has witnessed the unjust disinheritance, and divers cruel punishments, and dissolutions of natural ties. From the early persecutions in Alexandria, Smyrna, Rome, and Lyons, down to the recent annals of our Indian missions, there is the occurrence of the same phenomenon. And all through the history of Christianity, whenever the highest claims of divine love have been absolutely at war with the emphatic demands of family affection, when a worldly home has found itself sheltering the gentle dove, the unclean birds of prey have been roused from their quiescence, the eagles have been gathered together to destroy. Thus have been fulfilled the words of the meek and lowly Jesus, "I have come, not to send peace on earth, but a sword." The new conception of life has not however been mortally wounded by this sword. On the contrary, the ideal of a holier human love has dawned thus on a dark and angry world. The home, and the whole group of homes, affected by the presence of the new element have alike felt an electric thrill.

Other powers and authorities, as well as the relations between the parent and the child, have yielded to this divine influence. Barbarism in full panoply of armour, screaming defiance at the impalpable and mysterious energy, has been baffled by the unarmed majesty of goodness and spiritual power. On many a stormy sea, the soul of the regenerated has like that of Jesus rested from its labours in untroubled slumber. Terrified men "sailing o'er life's solemn main" have gone in fear and trembling to the sleeper. His simple life has been a light. He has at length spoken, and the winds and waves have been hushed by his voice. Unselfishness wrought into a principle is at first impracticable and troublesome, but it soon becomes feared and wondered at, and longed for. A revolution is effected in the society to which a truly unselfish man belongs. Many griefs and sorrows may be heaped upon his heart, but in some mysterious fashion they are borne away. Much-enduring sacrifice, holy love, and patience—by their mere existence—create a new standard of excellence. Thus "the

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

disciples" who in the first instance "went everywhere preaching the word," left their footprints on the sands of time, their impress on the life of men. A light had shined in the dark places of the earth, and although the light-bearers might be trampled down, lamps and all, into bloody dust beneath the feet of men, the prison-house in which the deed was done was never the same again, even to their murderers. The songs of Paul and Silas in their prison, quite as much as the earthquake, brought the jailor to cry, "What must I do to be saved?"

The love and grace and accessibleness of God were in the earliest days of the Gospel, and *are now*, inseparably associated with conceptions of His grandeur, His awfulness and righteousness; so that no smile is ever thrown on sin, no look allowed that palliates it, there is no momentary underrating of its evil, nor are its meanness, its corruption, or its dangers sanctioned. Not only so, the moral standard is indefinitely exalted, and becomes less capable of degradation or relaxation. The man in whom there is a divine life has a higher law within him than the regulations of society, or the apparent seductions of pleasure or self-interest. However great the temptation, he has said, "How can I do this wickedness, and sin against (not merely my friend or my master, but) God?" In face of hostile courts and armed authority, conscience quickened into sympathy with the mind of God, has said, "I must obey God rather than man." Thus an independence has been generated both of custom, of human law, and of apparent personal advantage. A new unmanageable force has been liberated, which mere law, persecution, crushing scorn, and worldly maxims can neither repress nor extinguish.

These phenomena of human life are as certainly verifiable as any facts of science, and these signs of the presence of the kingdom of God in the earth are among the most marvellous proofs of its existence. Christ, in the very beginning of His ministry, expected Nicodemus to discern them. The life of Christ became the most explicit revelation of the change introduced into human life, into humanity as a whole, by His incarnation. Every relation He sustained to every individual and class with whom He came into personal contact was strangely modified, and became a new thing in the earth, had a new meaning and

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

intention given to it. For many generations after this great work began, the effect produced upon the world, and the new standard given to every relation of life, are the most startling proofs of the reality of the kingdom of God. What must have happened thousands of times during the first four centuries, and what has happened tens of thousands of times since in every land where *THE LIFE* has been lived, is something like this. An unregenerated father has seen a patient, loving, praying wife or child bear his harsh temper and cruel exactions with a strange forbearance and unearthly sweetness, bowing lowly beneath an intolerable burden, neither complaining nor retaliating, and yet doing this from no weakness or cowardice, but from some new life power, some consciousness of a loftier ideal, and the realized presence of God Himself. Some giddy, thoughtless, pleasure-loving, self-indulgent girl has seen in her mother's eyes a gentle, holy rebuke unknown before. The very atmosphere breathed in that maternal love has seemed more fragrant, more bewitching and constraining. In the presence of that love it was henceforth impossible to be cold or frivolous. Under the spell of that presence the child has said, "I too have been brought into a new world." The master of slaves, or subjects, or "hands," who has hitherto regarded them merely as instruments by which his stronger will was working out his purposes, has found here and there some slave taking pleasure in his work, doing it in spite of lash or prison or task-master, with genuine sympathy or wish to please. The slave has heard a voice from heaven which has sanctified toil and hallowed obedience, and he has done his day's work "as unto the Lord, and not as unto men." On the other hand, the slaves of some heartless taskmaster have found out suddenly that their lord loved them, was grieving over their burdens, and trying to bear at least a portion of them himself,—that their poverty, instead of being their crime, did almost make them precious in his eyes. The man of wealth, and the possessor of numberless "hands," has clearly, obviously, in spirit if not in act, sold all that he had and given to the poor. In the least of his dependants he has seen the face of his own Lord and Master, and done far more than give the cup of cold water to the Incarnate God. The very relations of society have been reversed

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

by those who have had the Spirit of the Christ moving strongly within them. The wealthy, the cultured, the strong, the beautiful, have become as those that serve, that wash the feet of the poor, that minister consolation to the diseased, the outcast, the prisoner, and the convict. Roman ladies in the days of Jerome, feudal barons in the days of Columbanus or Patrick, Spanish nobles in the days of Loyola, Xavier, or Las Casas; country squires in the spirit and power of John Howard; Oxford dignitaries as under the inspiration of the Wesleys; Sisters of Mercy, Teutonic deaconesses, London ragged school teachers by the thousand, have all done this thing: they have sacrificed self, and position and comfort and home, for the love of the Christ whom they have seen imaged in a suffering or degraded human creature. When all this happens, the world first sneers, is then filled with amazement and incredulity, but after throwing at the quiet workers one depreciatory name after another—which, by the way, become transformed into badges of honour as they alight—at length comes to admit that here is the life of life, here is the sign of the presence of more than humanity, a new and true standard of excellence.

(2) *Another group of the relations between man and man consists of those which arise out of the possession or transfer of property.* Perhaps here the power of the new life has the hardest fight to maintain its existence. It is recognized through the whole history of the people of God that it is not every Christian man or woman who has a vocation to special self-abnegation, to ascetic exercise and voluntary poverty. Long, however, before the vows of perfection are thought of in the Roman Church, long before special ministry is accepted by the neophyte in any other communion, there is abundant practical scope for the powers of the divine life. "It is nought, it is nought, saith the buyer; and when he goeth his way he boasteth," has been the rule of merchandize all the world over. Self-interest first, the interest of others afterwards, if these can be secured in harmony with the interests of self, and without in the smallest degree detracting from them. To some extent this vile rule has prevailed even in so-called Christendom, and to such an extent that if any seller of merchandize pretends to be consulting the interests of others even on the same level, to

say nothing of a higher level than his own, he is at once set down as a visionary, a hypocrite, or a fool. Still the higher law has had its expression. There have been instances when the civilizer and Christian missionary to barbarians has really done the thing, has parted from his property with a strict, commanding, overwhelming desire to benefit others and not himself, even though while he did it his motives were misunderstood and vilified. More than this, the whole conduct of trade in Christian countries, and by those who are living a divine and holy life, has been incalculably elevated. There are now hundreds of thousands of traders who would not, to save their entire business, perhaps their life, deliberately and knowingly falsify or adulterate their wares or their products. Many would honestly confess that such high-minded conduct "pays," that "honesty is the best policy," that in the long run the truth is best, that a lie is delusive and unprofitable. Even these wretched travesties of grace, these degrading utilitarian maxims, are the ignoble fruit of a nobler ethic: they are the testimony borne by selfishness to unselfishness and justice. They prove that some have done the right because they abhorred evil—have taken no unfair advantage of their customer because they did in truth love their neighbour as themselves. There is divine force in the old law to which our Lord gave the highest expression both in word and life: "All things, whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." When men keep the law out of the love of it, there is a sign of a divine life at war with all the appetites, passions, self-interest of humanity. When selfish men "remember the words of the Lord Jesus, that it is more blessed to give than to receive," the old things are passing away, and all things becoming new.

(3) *Another group of relations arises out of the possession of special powers of body or mind.* Wherever a man has faculties which appear to be denied to any of his fellows, or which are limited to a small class, or which are only the result of long and laborious training and experience, he is a debtor to use those powers or faculties, not only for his personal advantage, but for that of others. The world comes to the artist, the scholar, the student of nature, the great traveller, the highly

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

educated or skilled labourer in any and every department, and says, "Pay what you owe;" "Give to us of your abundance;" "Work while it is day." When the scholar, or the artist, or the artificer is conscious of his high vocation as a man, and has tested the powers of the world to come, and knows how the Lord will require an account of his stewardship, he pours new meaning and throws new zest into his work, and creates a new sense of obligation in the world.

The relations of *art* with the religious life are so abundant, and have run so strange a race, that they will be separately discussed in this series of essays; but it is sufficiently obvious that whatever may now be the functions of the artist, in dealing with Christian ideas and worship, he has played a conspicuous stake in the civilization of mankind. He has raised the ethical ideal of men. He has assisted the higher emotions. He has not only set forth divine ideas in words, colours, and forms, but he has raised the tone of human feeling. The progress of art has recorded the high-level of the tides of Christian emotions, as well as sometimes displayed their lowest ebb, with its vast reaches of silt, shipwreck, and slimy defilement. We know how the ideals of Greek art triumphed long over the so-called Church, and with what fondness we continually turn to the highest Greek expression of human beauty, power, and fate, to its conception of pleasure and grief, of triumph and defeat; but nothing is more patent than that a new conception needed new hands and fresh genius, an imagination that could soar into other regions, an inspiration, vision, and faculty to perceive and express a loftier ideal of life and virtue, of sorrow and blessedness, of order and of rule. We may yet trace this process from the bas-reliefs that have been taken from the catacombs, and from the oldest, rudest specimens of Christian poetry, sculpture, or music, through all the ages, down to the grandest displays of it in the days of Giotto, Dante, Michael Angelo, and Raphael. But we do not find the progress arrested there. Beyond the borders of the so-called Church Catholic there is the open secret, and the transcendent vision; and there too the artist has his function, somewhat limited in scope by the broader view he takes of truth, but within that range intensified, and demanding at the present moment a continuously fresh development of his powers.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Again, the conditions of successful *scholarship* are sincerity, perseverance, deep humility, love of truth for its own sake, elevation above all mean or partizan warfare. These conditions are for the most part moral and spiritual, and the characteristics of mind that issue in the highest scholarship are those which have been best learned at the cross of Christ. Scholarship in its grandest forms has been the creation of Christianity, for there the high end of glorifying God has inspired "sincerity;" the majesty and splendour of "truth" have been interpenetrated by and translucent to the light of eternity; and the thoughts of God, the preciousness of the truth, and its value to the souls of men, have aided the scholar in forgetting self. The utterance, preservation, diffusion, honour of truth have created the far-stretching priesthood of letters; but apart from such special stimulus given to the artist and the scholar—a similar argument may be easily advanced for the student of nature and the artificer; and it is certain that if men possessed of powers of perception, design, or expression, have become the subjects of the divine life, and have had their nature interfused with divine light; a consecration has fallen on their whole work, and it has been done with a force, an enthusiasm, an ulterior and God-directed purpose which have transfigured it.

It is not necessary to enlarge further on this theme. The history of the introduction of Christianity into every nation and every form of civilization, the history of the sway even within Christendom of the sometimes hidden but ever germinant powers of divine truth and life, the diffusion of the mind of Christ, and the consecration of the family, the community, and the State; the baptism of art, science, scholarship, trade, legislation, diplomacy, with Christian thoughts, have all illustrated that entire modification of the common relations between man and man which is effected by the regeneration of individuals.

It would be easy to make the conjecture, to state the imaginary case—which in some of its features and more salient points is no imagination, but a sober fact—of all Christian influence in a community, or race, or nation being practically reduced to this action of individuals upon the society, the humanity of which they form a part. Let us suppose that all the Christianity of some community consisted in the divine life of

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

scattered men or women who have been converted and sanctified by the Holy Spirit, yet that every form and feature of society, from its rudimental germ in the family, to the action of the State as a whole, is vibrating and pulsating with a new life, with a higher sense of being; let us suppose that direct personal communion with the Father of Spirits, that the conscious presence of the eternal and a new strange love of man as man have begun to penetrate human thought, snapping old fetters, opening blind eyes and filling them with tears—then, though there may be as yet no “gathering together” unto Christ, though it were not possible that even “two or three” should meet in the Beloved Name, though there were no organization, no order, no sacrament, no buildings adapted for worship or common prayer, no ritual, no chorus of praise, there would still be the signs of the kingdom of God among that people. In addition to the invisible and elect host of regenerated souls, —“the Church of the first-born,”—there would be one great department of a visible Catholic Church. Whatever theory be entertained about the nature and notes of the true Church, it would be difficult for any theorist to deny that this vast category of gracious influences—emanating from individuals who are one with God through Jesus Christ, and independent of the ecclesiastical system which may for all that be believed to be divine—constitutes one large and most impressive element in the life of the Church. Cut it off, suppose it non-existent, leave it out of calculation, and the degree to which the whole Church would be impoverished, starved, stripped bare, is utterly incalculable. In other words, confine the Church, its life, its love, its truth, even the signs and notes of its existence, to its own churchly acts, you would ring its knell, and might as well bury it at once in its deep grave. It is now incumbent upon me to speak of,—

II. The relations, the *new* relations which spring up and prevail between those who are alike regenerated by the Holy Spirit.

If two lonely travellers meet on a mountain pass, by the very fact that they are *men*, they recognize certain mutual obligations. If they discover on nearer approach that they speak the same mother-tongue, or are subjects of the same

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

political government, or are following the same profession, or are interested as rivals or enemies or friends in the pursuit of a common object; if they find moreover that holy bonds of brotherhood link them to each other, that they have in fact been long searching for each other, and at length the event anticipated is thus unexpectedly consummated: with every fresh discovery, these two men are thrown into new relations, and become conscious of augmenting obligations. The community or reciprocity of interests evokes new significance out of their casual meeting.

Now the man of faith who has within himself a new and divine life, who endures as seeing Him that is invisible, who declares plainly that he seeks a country, who has passed from death unto life, cannot assume any position in this world, as father, ruler, merchant, artist, teacher, learner, worker, without modifying all his external relations from what they would have been without the grace of God. But a strange and glorious change occurs when all these relations themselves are sustained by those who have common interests, who are alike alive unto God through Jesus Christ.

It is a startling thing for a *family* to find *one* of its members adopted into the family of God. A new social force is thus originated which may be as a sword or a fire, or which may become a transforming diffusive influence destined to blend all the elements of that family life into its own likeness; but a *Christian family* is a profoundly different thing. If the family supplies the starting-point of human society, the Christian family is the unit of the divine society. The "Church in a house" offers the most vivid picture and microcosm of the entire Church in all its grandest features. The conjugal bond is now the type of a still holier, diviner union. The children that are born into the sphere created by this holy love, may, and do, inherit a damaged nature, but from the first moment of existence the young child is submitted to gracious influence, it is put where sights and sounds, and discipline and example, contend with its natural selfishness. The father and mother know that in their parental love the child is to learn its first lessons in the nature of God THE FATHER. The prayer that is daily, hourly offered over the infant for grace to reg-

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

nerate and sanctify its young life, the custom and order of the household, the way in which sin is seen to be a grievous and bitter thing, in which redemption is shown to be needful, in which a higher life than that of the flesh is forced upon the attention and evoked within the consciousness of the child; the way in which the true priesthood of paternal and maternal love offers up a daily sacrifice of gratitude, and receives from the divine hand the daily bread and daily cup of blessing or of sorrow,—all this has created a new thing in the earth. Father, mother, child, form a sublime unity of life-giving force. Art has consecrated this divine conception in its loftiest expression. Sacraments have been used but feebly to express the full meaning of this divine co-working of God the Spirit, not only with the individual, but in the family. Baptism is the expressive symbol of the influence which the Holy Spirit exerts in all Christian nurture. Further, into this unit of society are brought fresh elements, which develop not only the relation of brother and sister to each other, but that of brother and sister in Christ. When brothers and sisters of such a family sympathize in the divine idea which pervades it, when one and all are called into the fellowship of the Eternal Son, when worship and consecration and obedience, when mutual trust and love, and common prayer are contending with the world that comes unbidden into each heart, the power of grace has numerous and ever-multiplying organs for its operation. God opens in such a family many a door into the invisible; sickness, infirmity, or death will provoke unto love and sacrifice. The son may have to become the head of such a household, to become the husband to his widowed mother, the father to his orphaned sisters. Thus, or in many other analogous ways, the reality of the divine life of the whole fellowship becomes a distinct matter of consciousness.

Apart from the Christian family, the life of the Church as a whole would be dried up. We grant that the ideal is not always realized even where every step that we have described is sanctified or typified by some ceremonial of greater or less significance. The marriage of the parents, the consecration of the children by prayer and thanksgiving to God, the daily communion with heaven, the last offices of love to dying saints, may

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

be called "sacraments," and be solemnized by venerable ritual. But it is a fact of world-wide observation, that these *names* and *acts*, and this mere *ritual*, do not limit the reality, and are by no means co-extensive with that divine thing the Christian family. It is true that the most portentous marriage ceremonial does not ensure conjugal fidelity, that hundreds of thousands of baptized children cannot by any kind of analysis or by reason of their sanctity or their love to God be distinguished from the unbaptized. But it cannot be denied that Christian households are, on the other hand, the great barrier against the rising tides of the world, the flesh, and the devil. The sentiment, force of piety and stimulus to holy living generated by the life of God in a Christian family is the chief end aimed at in all Christian teaching, association, and service. If all the world of adult men and women were persuaded by intellectual inducements and other gracious influences to consent to the truth, to accept the law of Christ, to become part of any one visible Christian community,—then, unless provision were also made to bring the next generation under this divine influence, in the course of a few years the whole work would have to be repeated *de novo*. Consequently, very much of the grace needed to secure the life of the Holy Catholic Church must be that which meets, controls, preoccupies, sanctifies the infant life of the generation that is to come. Parental piety, godly example, and Christian nurture do transform every father into a minister and priest, every home into a temple, and every family circle into a Church of the living God. The Christian family is then one great element of any just estimate of what constitutes the Holy Catholic Church.

Let us look at another of the groups of relations of which we have spoken—such, *e.g.*, as the *tribe*, the *commonwealth*, the *feudal or constitutional government*, or the *nation with its supreme governing principle or centre*. We have already referred to the modification effected when certain individuals sustaining personal relations to their rulers, or fellow-subjects, or fellow-governors, become new creatures in Christ. When Christian men, disciples of the Holy Jesus, first came into relation with kings and rulers, they were "hated of all men for His name's sake." They were felt to entertain revo-

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

lutionary ideas, to belong to a kingdom that was "*not of this world*," to have a citizenship in heaven which might make them disloyal subjects of their earthly rulers. The kings of the earth could not brook such rivals. Old precedents, dignified ceremonial, hoary establishments, solemn courts of justice, first scoffed, then trembled, then persecuted, and finally were swept away by the power of a faith in the unseen King, by men who believed that Jesus was the Son of God. But this state of transition and conflict has been the prelude to another relation between the spiritual and temporal power. The missionary aspect of the Christian life and society towards states or nations, free cities or despotic chieftains, is not in the nature of things a permanent one. The "life" which is "light" illumines the darkness of the grave, and shows the insignificance of all the physical, human, and legal sanctions to effective authority, in comparison with the infinite sanction given to moral relations by the hand of God Himself, and so the temporal authority has succumbed before the supreme claims of conscience and of religious conviction. "The world"—*i. e.*, humanity irrespective of the divine life—is overcome by faith. The hostile secular power has yielded or been exhausted in its conflict with the spiritual force. It has always given way so far as eventually to retire from the sphere ruled by the Spirit of God; and this step has been the precursor to that in which the governing power of the State or nation acts from the same high principle, and is itself sanctified by the grace of God. If a king has felt the higher kingship of Jesus, if a judge has recognized the eternal law embodied in the life of Christ as the principle on which he determines the equity of a claim that is pleaded before him; if a senate or court, if a board of ministry, or council of warriors have come to consist of those who have passed from death unto life, who are redeemed from the curse of sin by the sacrifice of the cross, and if they proceed to make or repeal laws, to proclaim peace or war, and to enact observances, as the servants of Christ, and as those who will themselves be judged by the Lord; if the corporate action of a State is directed by the love of God and man; if the State itself has "holiness to the Lord" written on all its institutions, and evinced in all its great and significant acts, we do not speak of

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

this as an establishing of religion by the State, but as the establishing and exaltation of the State by religion.* Such a consecration may have been witnessed at certain periods in the history of Christianity. I do not refer to the epoch when the Roman Emperors began to patronize the clergy, and threw the ægis of their protection over a particular organization of a certain form of Christian doctrine, but rather to the evidence existing that a higher morality than had hitherto been current had penetrated even the spirit with which imperial edicts were promulgated. The laws of Alfred, far more than the victory of Roman over British and Celtic ecclesiastics, or than the establishment by kings and bishops of a certain ecclesiastical *régime*, demonstrate the extent to which the divine life in individuals began to appear as the divine life of communities. The few instances where league, covenant, or contract between the formers and founders of a State, has been deliberately framed in deference to the supreme authority of Christ have demonstrated the possibility of the identity, not the alliance, of Church and State.† The alliances of ecclesiastical associations with secular powers, of which we have had a series of miserable failures, and which are now one by one ceasing to exist as legislative enactments, reflect in many instances the godly earnestness of great churchmen and the conscientious zeal of distinguished statesmen; they may, moreover, have furthered the kingdom of Christ in days when the resources of the State far exceeded those of the Missionary Church, but they are only the partial and transitory expression of a much sublimer idea, viz., that of the elements of a State being Christian, and disposed to act on the authority and in the name and spirit of Jesus Christ. It is an inopportune moment in the world's history to speak of the Christianity of nations. The two foremost peoples of Europe who rejoice in a superabundance of ecclesiastical establishment, and doubtless contain great multitudes of individuals who are living a divine life, have brought into derision the idea of a Christian nation. Their fierce struggle for power and

* See Mr. E. R. Conder's Essay "Ecclesia."

† Mr. Baldwin Brown has recently argued this point with so much force in his "First Principles of Ecclesiastical Life," as to render an elaboration of it unnecessary.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

pre-eminence in Europe would have disgraced the pre-Christian times. It demonstrates that neither nation, as a nation, is Christian. There may be thousands, nay millions of men in both who as individuals are in fellowship with God in Christ, but these are, as yet, powerless to impress the tone of Christian equity or love upon the governing principle of either France or Germany. Can Britain, or America, or Spain, or Italy, or Russia, except in the most modified, imperfect, and fragmentary sense, be spoken of as Christian nations? No; we have the sublime ideal of the interpenetration of the kingdoms of this world with the spirit and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we are far from seeing as yet any adequate realization of the ideal. But as far as there is such modification of national life by the spirit of Christ, wheresoever communities of men, or kings of men, are acting out of deference to the will of Christ, (it may be against their own interest,) wherever we can trace in nations something of the transformation which has passed over individuals and families under the grace of God, there too is the *Holy Church* VISIBLE. Thrones and sceptres surmounted by the cross, solemn temples, gorgeous ritual, loud profession of the name of Christ, legal instruments interlarded with Christian phraseology, a national recognition of Christian officers and teachers which confers upon them place or wealth or rank, do not make the Church visible; but when a great nation turns to God in thanksgiving or humiliation, when high impulses of humanity lead a nation spontaneously to succour the wretched, or liberate the slave, when the horrors of war are alleviated by courage, self-sacrifice, and Christlike love, when a high enthusiasm for Christian truth and for the honour of the Lord Christ moves the whole community and controls its national acts, then *the life* is manifest, not the raiment; then the bride of the Lamb, the elect spouse of Christ, comes out of her bridal chamber; then the Church, Holy, Catholic, Eternal, becomes truly visible to the eyes of men.

There is another group of relations between those who are regenerated by the grace of God which is often spoken of as though it exclusively constituted the visible Church of God, viz., *the association and communion of spiritual persons for purposes of faith, prayer, and service*,—the body of Christ,

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

consisting of many members,—the building of God, inhabited by His Spirit,—the *ecclesia docens* and the *ecclesia discens*,—the worshipping assembly,—the kingdom of God organized in society. Many of our Catholic friends (though the word “friends” is rather a presumptuous term for a voluntary and a nonconformist to use in such a connection) are fond of extinguishing the advocates of the spiritual idea of the Church by referring to the parable of the drag-net, as though it alone represented the idea of a visible and Catholic Church. Surely the parables of the mustard-seed and the leaven, of the seed growing secretly, of the sower and his seed, are, with many others, meant to portray different aspects of the kingdom of God. We are often accused of repudiating the unspeakable advantages of Church life, and the supernatural features of the body of Christ, because we do not accept a particular corporation as the society of Jesus; but nothing can be further from the facts of the case. I do not wish to pursue even this part of my argument, in the spirit of partizan or of an apologist for any particular form of Church government. I wish simply to call attention to matters of fact, which reveal the reality of a divine and supernatural life. “Wherever two or three are met together in the name” of Jesus Christ, there is in fact more than the life of the two or three individuals; and the sanctity, energy, and spiritual fruit of that life proclaim the presence of the Lord Himself. It is a necessity of the new life that it should instinctively associate and combine those who share it. Common convictions, interests, and duties are continually leading men to form fellowships, companies, and orders for the growth and expansion of personal convictions for the better discharge of obvious duties. Science, literature, philanthropy, and politics, art and commerce, by a law of our being, do thus seek to extend their boundaries, and to give expression to their inner life. This is peculiarly the case with religious conviction, which is especially dependent upon the association of kindred spirits. Most certainly a large element of religious truth makes its appeal to the understanding, and rests for its proofs upon substantial evidence. Present the evidence to unbiassed intelligence, and conviction is the legitimate result. Here religion is one with science,

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

literature, and politics. It is readily admitted here that the co-operation of numbers is desirable even in these regions of activity, because the minds of men are preoccupied and interested with other themes, and their attention is best attracted to new departments of inquiry by something more than mere reasonableness. Even self-interest is not enough to secure adhesion to a startling novelty in science, or the repeal of an old law. The preoccupation of minds has to be overcome by something more than the force of argument, or the bold statement of truth. If *one great savant* has discovered a law of nature previously unconjectured, assent to his arguments is languid or positively refused by many who are quite competent to deal with the data on which his conclusions rest, simply from the inertia of belief. When his ideas are accepted by a few others, and have stood the test of hostile criticism, opposition and indifference slowly break down. When men at length wake up to realize the circumstance that many scientific students of nature have accepted this conclusion as undoubted fact, then, perhaps by an illicit process, the inertia of thousands is disturbed, and the truth is generally received. In the same way with political principles, which almost always appeal to the past and prophecy the future, and enlist self-interest on their side, it is not until the thinkers by the force of powerful association confirm each others conviction, and declare with united voice their confident anticipations, that the assent of mankind is yielded to their arguments.

The conviction which is at length secured in these regions of thought is moreover not always the result of ratiocination, or personal experience. There are at this moment in England comparatively few persons who have any intelligible idea as to what the law of gravitation is, what are the grounds on which the figure of the earth is determined, or what is the nature and *rationale* of spectrum analysis; but thousands who entertain no doubt on these points do so chiefly because they know that if these things were not as the philosophers say, other men would be found to disprove the positions so confidently asserted. Others who do not refuse their assent to the conclusions of science, and who are totally unable to verify them, are mainly, if unconsciously, driven into acquiescence on the

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

ground that if they had had time and education to traverse the argument, there would be no insuperable obstacle to their personally coming to the same conclusion. They do accept on authority certain grand results arrived at by men competent to frame them—always, however, with the inner proviso that there is no inherent reason why they should not have personally verified the entire process of proof. It is not just or honest to say that the authority on which all religious truth or fact is presented is of this kind. It is true with reference to the evidence on which the authenticity of the books of the New Testament really turns; it is true with reference to many historical facts on which Christianity and the Church take their stand. The ordinary Christian may receive the results of criticism and translation, on the authority of the scholars or critics whose words he is disposed to trust, because he believes that he might go over for himself all the documents and processes through which they have passed, and come to the same conclusion. The profound difference of opinion even here staggers thoughtful laymen and busy Christians who have no time to judge between Bishop Colenso and Professor Keil, or between Neander and Strauss, but a firm persuasion satisfies intelligent men that sooner or later science will come to final conclusions on the genuineness and value of certain records, and that mere numbers, associated on the one side or the other, will not make one atom of difference as to the fact, or the final concurrence of all sensible men as to the result.

Authority, however, is made to cover very much more than this, when we proceed to ask why do we believe in the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the orthodox doctrine of His person, or His redemption, when we accept the doctrine of the future life or judgment, or the reality of the eternal world. We cannot have scientific, or historic, or experimental proofs of these things. We might even have stood beside the cross, and not have seen what Peter or John saw there; we might have looked on the face of the risen Jesus, and been among the "some" who "doubted;" we might have heard Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, and have remained unmoved; or we might, after listening to Stephen's apology, have rushed on him with stones in our hands and murder in

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

our hearts. Scientific men tell us, when we assert our deep conviction of the presence and rule of the Almighty, of the positive redemption effected by Incarnate God, of the coming and grace of the Spirit of the Father and the Son, of the powers of the world to come, of resurrection from the dead, and eternal judgment, that we are going beyond the domain of science. We do indeed transcend the region of the physical senses; we bring our moral sense, our faith-sense, our higher reason, our transcendental faculties, into play. We look on Him that is invisible, we know that which passes knowledge, we receive a heavenly unction, we see and hear and feel that which eye hath not seen, ear hath not heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive.

More than this, I am disposed very diffidently to assert that the transcendental element of our knowledge is the larger moiety of that knowledge. It is moreover that which, in spite of science, and in defiance of its methods to penetrate or establish or disprove, is the most precious. We can part with all beside, but we cannot part with this. When a man knows that he is drawing near to the infinite and eternal world, the whole realm of physical science becomes insignificant and worthless to him in comparison with that truth of things which is concealed by the veil of the material. Now it is just here that fellowship and sympathy are as life from the dead. "Two or three are met together in the name" of Christ, and then their common love to Him, and faith in Him, quicken and augment their personal faith, so that in a sense in which He is not present with each, He is in the midst of them. Almost all confessions of faith and dogmatic symbols are the result of the co-operation of believing men trying to put into common form their transcendental convictions. When a prophet came to Israel, and proclaimed the name of the Lord, and men's hearts were bowed as the trees of the wood by the wind, it was in virtue of what was common to the inner life of the seer and the people. There is prodigious emphasis given to the prophet's mission by this concurrence. The flowing together and blending of ideas beyond the range of experience, or logical proof, takes the *onus* of proof, and provides a practical substitute for evidence.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

All the world over, and through all the ages, the principle has been at work. It has not been limited to Christianity. Men have not verified, and could not prove, the revelations of Buddha as to his interminable previous existences, and his final Nirvâna; but by hundreds of millions they have striven, by dogmas and councils and sacred texts, and the fellowship of confidence and worship, to support each other's faith in this huge system of speculation. The people of Ephesus tried to resist the faith in those mysterious truths which were turning the world upside-down, by the utterance of their own transcendental conviction, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." The pomp of religious ceremonial provides continually a great expression for these unproved and undemonstrable beliefs. People even now assemble by tens of thousands to sustain each other in their confidence, that a piece of bread is transubstantiated into the present Deity, that a Pope is infallible, that the shadow on the dial-plate of time can be held back by their united, eager protestations. They do not, cannot know these things, as they know the historic facts of Revelation, or as they know the order of the earth's strata, or as they know the face of their friend, or even as they count upon the future evolution of the cycle of certain physical changes; but the intensity of their conviction in unseen mysteries is quickened by reiteration, by common faith, and mutual persuasion. They agree together that it is so, and the nascent doubt is quelled, not by argument, by proof, by vision of the invisible, by fresh or supernatural revelations, but by the answering glance and continuous confidence of those who have never felt the doubt. The overwhelming conviction displayed by congregated thousands, that some huge idol is a thing of power and dread, will over-master for a long while the incipient scepticism of those who, though in the heart of the crowd, may have begun to say and feel that an idol is not anything to the world. Even the Protestant who sees Pio Nono distribute his indulgence from the balcony of St. John Lateran, amid the clangour of trumpets and the roar of artillery, finds it hard to maintain at the moment his deeply rooted persuasion that there is nothing whatever underlying that significant act. All religion, to the degree that it goes beyond the region of the demon-

strable, and appeals to the inner sense, however rational may be the appeal, however free from contradiction or inherent inconsistency, is greatly dependent on the aid derivable from the common and united expression of these undemonstrable convictions. The divine life in the individual, the personal relation instituted between a regenerated man and the living God, will yearn after sympathy, will feed and be greatly nourished by the expression of genuine faith on the part of a brother. Faith is contagious. Confidence or terror soon diffuse themselves through a community. My brother's confidence in what he and I believe to be true is no proof to me of its truth, but it is a powerful substitute for proof. Every strong persuasion and intense conviction of truth sighs for sympathy, lives by the strong endeavour to diffuse itself. The hearty sympathy of a few minds that are in perfect accord is worth more than the knowledge that millions agree to abide by some incredible standard of faith. It is not the undoubted and indubitable facts of science, history, or literature, or the perfectly obvious deductions from fundamental principles of belief, that excite intense desire on the part of their possessors to diffuse belief in them. He who at all understands these is absolutely certain that they will, sooner or later, secure universal assent. If a man discover a natural law, he does not organize a society to assist belief in it. It is, however, quite otherwise with the deepest truths of religion, and the strongest intuitions of the soul, such as the being and character of God, the person and presence of the Christ, the beauty of holiness, the certainty of judgment, the life eternal, the power of prayer, faith, and sacrifice. The best words that we can use to describe these sublime realities are but approximations to what we know about them. The most elaborate proofs we bring for them are not the kind of evidence that will satisfy an equity lawyer, or a scientific *savant*; but it is in these that we most long for personal sympathy,—not the mere *placet* of a multitude, but the fellowship of kindred minds. Here sympathy, powerless in the matter of science, becomes almost allied to proof.

This fundamental element of all religious associations, obviously present in the grand communities of men, is perhaps most potent where there is the most ample scope for sympathy.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

From the two or three who know that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the midst of them, on to the great societies which make the same united confession, there is the manifestation of the same divine life in humanity. If certain members of these great societies, from St. Cyprian down to Archbishop Manning, say that unless we belong to their society, we cannot know so divine a fact, we reply that the "two or three" are just as competent to deny the competency of the great community to do this thing, as the great community is to deny that of the "two or three." "No celestial city!" said "Christian" to "Atheist," "no such place as the Heavenly Jerusalem! Did we not see it from the Delectable Mountains?" Real assent to a great spiritual reality, quickened by common intuitions, is indestructible.

The fact is that the divine life in humanity will continually express itself in *societies* framed with a view to promote a common fellowship and faith in divine and transcendental truth. It is unnecessary here to review the part which the great historic Churches have taken in the development of this idea. I am anxious to direct attention to the intense vitality, the quickening energy and sanctifying force of other societies which are now on a vast scale spread throughout the world, and which are become in their turn the nurses of faith, the scenes of prayer, the centres of holy service. There are tens of thousands of these associations of Christians which grant mutual aid in stimulating faith, in exciting religious imagination, in assisting common prayer and thanksgiving and service. Many of these societies can glory in one, two, or even three hundred years of conscious and distinct existence; they have been the mothers of other fellowships, have sent forth their representatives into heathen lands, and are enriched by holy memories. The atmosphere of divine thought and the stimulus of holy feeling pervade them. Marriage, parentage, new creation, solemn death-scenes, ordination vows, combinations for enlarged usefulness, generous self-sacrifice, all bear their memories into such Churches, and help to promote their life. A saintly ministry hangs like a perfume round the very walls where it has been conducted. The moral, intellectual, and spiritual power exerted by some pastors over and through some Churches is as interesting and beautiful

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

as the influence of St. Benedict over the community of Monte Cassino, or the sway of St. Francis over the chapters of his order. It is within the community that the spirit of forgiveness and charity is quickened into activity, and has scope for its manifestation. The member of such a brotherhood imbibes the average spirit of the community. At all events he is credited with it, and contributes his part towards its growth, or deterioration. There is the service of song which pioneers the way for infant minds into the deep mysteries of God, which cheers and soothes the worker and wayfarer, lightens his burden, and opens to him the invisible. Prayer and praise are rising heavenwards and Godwards in an unceasing volume of holy incense. As the Christian family by its family life reveals the reality of the Church of God, so the united life, praise, faith, and work of the Christian association reveals another and perhaps a loftier side of the true Church.

It is a vital question whether any one of these Christian associations may rise up and say, "We alone in our fellowship render the divine life in humanity visible to the world, and all others are spurious, are inchoate, are unlovely." May the Society of Jesus, or that of St. Vincent de Paul, arrogate to itself all the grace of the Roman Catholic Church? Shall the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, say, "We, and we alone, among all English Christians care for the heathen world, or are expressing genuine love or compassion for souls"? Will the Bible Society be justified in saying, "Apart from and beyond our association, no one loves the word of God, or is doing anything to promote its circulation"? An indignant negative is the obvious reply to all these questions. Is not a limitation of the divine life in humanity, of the Holy Ghost in society, to a particular historic society or group of societies, one of the fetishes of Christendom?

The societies of Christians, of men, women, children who are linked together by a divine hope, by a common faith in the unseen, generate a blessed and divine atmosphere of sacred love and mutual sympathy. The sorrow of one is the grief of all. The sin of one is the shame of all. The joy of one is the bliss of all. The common prayer blends the hearts of many into one great heart which bleeds over the wretchedness of the

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

world, and which lifts its praise and thanksgiving into the ear of God. The old and young sit together at the same blessed feet; they cling together to the same hand outstretched from heaven; they walk side by side to many a sacred grave. There is within these fellowships much of the great agony and joy of travailing in birth for the souls of men. There are fathers in God, and children in the faith. There are brothers and sisters in a common love to the Elder Brother who is the Master of the feast of grace. To belong to such a fellowship is to have work assigned in the way of feeding the hungry, or clothing the naked, of reclaiming the outcast, or educating the young. Intense desire is felt by multitudes in these fellowships for the vivid realization of the divine life, for the sanctification of the Church, for the reclamation of the ungodly. The word of God is ministered, and the holy Eucharist is dispensed, gloriously expressing the divine life of the whole, while the grace that is given to all becomes the seal of the Saviour's love. He is Himself present, and those who sing His glorious name know that He is there.

Now in drawing this picture I believe I have described the circle of holy influence that surrounds many a French *curé*, the work and feeling of many a parish priest in England, the saintly joys of many a sacred fellowship of Christians in Germany and Scotland and England and America, that may bear very different names, and need not to be particularized. I am not here concerned to establish the exclusive claims of any organization to the possession of these high privileges of the body of Christ. That body is more than raiment. "The head may say to the hand, or the hand to the foot, 'I have no need of thee;' but is it *therefore* not of the body?" The life of the Christian fellowship is the same everywhere. Science for many years seemed resolved on splitting up the human race into many distinct stocks, and some have looked on the strangely shaped skull or coloured skin, and said these Bosjemen or Malays cannot be children with us of the same Father; but even science tends now again to the assertion of a fundamental unity underlying all the differences. So with the life of the Church of God on earth, we must admit that it has presented very strange and diverse features, but every day now tends to show that

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

the combining principles of love to God and fealty to Christ produce in association the most wonderful resemblances. When the Holy Ghost works, it creates a common likeness that cannot be mistaken. How shall we characterize the dogmatism which prevents Churches from recognizing the signs of the divine life, not only in individuals, but in each other's associations? Out of them all have emerged martyr-like zeal, holy self-sacrifice, earnest living, constant prayer and praise, and intense desire to do the will of God. The superficial differences of form and order are so conspicuous, the degrees of importance attached by individuals to the body to which they belong differ so widely, that many, looking from one to the other, fail to discern the kingdom of God. The Romanist accuses the pious Protestant of invincible ignorance because he cannot see in one venerable organization the signs of the supernatural revelation of the divine will as to the discipline of the Christian community. It is easy for the Protestant to retort the same charge. It does to him seem invincible ignorance or incomprehensible blindness on the part of the Romanist that either he cannot adequately see or will not allow the working of the divine Spirit and Life in other associations of Christians, and apart from a visible unity of order. The true-born Briton of the last century did not believe in the civilization or Christianity of those who did not speak the king's English; and cultivated classes in China, to the present day, hold the civilization of all the rest of the world in undisguised contempt. Surely the tone of the Anglican, Greek, and Roman Catholic Churches with reference to all other communions is profoundly Chinese in its bitterness and unreasoning self-importance. The spirit of Christianity is opposed to this mere *esprit de corps*. It came into the world charged with the mission of general and gracious recognition. Its first triumphs were won over the narrowness which would refuse the name of disciple or brother to Samaritan or Gentile. The essential spirit of Protestantism was embodied in St. Paul. All the history of the Churches ever since has shown that the semi-idolatry of the body, the isolations of visible order, the contagious prejudices of organized communities, however high their professions and noble many of their motives, have been at war with the true love of humanity.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Esprit de corps may have its place and function in the world, but it is the antagonistic pole to the "enthusiasm of humanity." Sacrifice of self to the interests of a society, though it is much nobler than selfishness, and is fulfilling, like Judaism and Pharisaism, its course in the evolution of human progress, is yet an effectual barrier to that grander thing, the sacrifice of a society to the well-being of humanity. The first disciples slowly, perhaps never altogether, emerged from the delusion that except a man should be circumcised, and keep the law of Moses, he could not be saved through Christ. Thanks be to God, the Church did break these leading-strings, but it was only to fall into an analogous fallacy or embodiment of the same narrowness when it has said, Except a man belong to a particular organization of Christianity, and pass sacramentally into the same visible order, he cannot be saved.

The relations instituted between spiritual or regenerated persons are by no means confined to the origination of societies which aim at providing opportunities and places for religious instruction and communion, and which do so much towards promulgating Christian dogma, preserving Christian tradition, and celebrating Christian sacraments. *Surely the Church, the Christendom of our days, is also visible in those multiform associations which aim at the mitigation of human sorrow and need.* There is an aggregate of charity, of labour, of self-sacrifice, of systematic goodness, of enlightened humanity, in all the countries of so-called Christendom, which is nothing less than the manifestation of the Spirit of God in our humanity. Hardly can a form of disease or wretchedness offer itself to view, than, apart from all dogmatic preferences or denominational predilections, men and women are found co-operating for its removal or relief, and sacrificing health, comfort, and life in doing this Christlike work. The fellowship of these holy ministries, the sanctifying power of these associations, the universality and catholicity of these manifestations, make them a part of the one great visible Church of Christ. The work voluntarily undertaken by every priest or presbyter, by every congregational pastor, by every Methodist minister, may fairly be looked at apart from the dogma he teaches, the manner of his ordination, or the style of the worship he offers to the Great Father

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

of our Lord Jesus Christ; and it would be difficult to say where is the difference between them; the manifestation of the life in all its fulness is the same, a large portion of the work is absolutely identical, for it is the simple utterance of the mind and heart and life of Christ to a suffering, sinning, dying world. In the contemplation of such work we may "see the kingdom of God." It is in this, rather than in the sumptuous building, or the choral symphony, or the eloquent discourse, that the Church is visible, and shows itself to be One, holy, to the eye of faith undivided, and both Catholic and immortal.

III. I have yet to add a few words on the *new relations that are called into existence in the outside world by the supernatural divine life thus manifested in humanity*. These include all the indirect effects of Christianity on the thought of the world, as well as the indirect consequences of the new life of the Church upon the moral standards of an unregenerated world. There is diffused through general society a different atmosphere of thought from that which is due to unchristianized humanity. It is clear that at the time of Christ and His apostles there had in some mysterious way, which cannot be accurately traced, gone forth into the schools of philosophy a new spirit, and even a new phraseology. The correspondences which may be traced between the epistles of St. Paul and St. John, and the writings of Philo, Seneca, and Epictetus, cannot be explained by direct mutual influence. The excitement produced in Oriental schools of speculation by the stupendous doctrine of the Incarnation, the higher notion of liberty, of virtue, of the sexual relation that was gaining ground in the West *pari-passu* with Christianity, the efforts made by the Neo-Platonists and Epicureans to satisfy the necessities which Christianity had revealed to men, and adequately met, are indications of what I mean in the first three centuries. At the present moment, far beyond the limits of any professed deference to the Lord Jesus Christ, there is the deep recognition of the principles of His Gospel. Scepticism itself is in many of its forms converted; it may be scepticism still, but its tone is modified. From all sides there is an approach by the higher spirits of our age towards each other.

A common standard of excellence, a common ideal of humanity, is rising out of the anarchy and agony of our times.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Even heathenism confesses it, and acts upon it. There is a mutual disposition in bitter opponents to admit each other's honesty and earnestness of intention. The legislation of great nations may be less and less formally interspersed with religious dogmatism, and certain Christian institutions may cease to have a claim on the public exchequer, or the patronage of the great; but legislation is becoming more and more humane, more equitable, more reverential to conscience, more alive to the real existence of the Church, and more manifestly a part of the Church; in one word, it is more Christian. There is, indeed, an enormous amount of work to be done before the Church is conterminous with the nation, with its legislation, its literature, its art, its commerce, its science, its social diversions, its diplomatic relations; and a still larger amount of work must be done before the Christianizing process shall pass over all nations and sanctify them,—before the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ; but there need be no doubt whatever of the progress of our humanity towards that divine consummation. There have been moments when it might seem that the world's education was arrested. The fall of Jerusalem must have seemed to Hebrew Christians to be the end of the world. The mother-Church of Christendom, with all its sublime anticipations, was apparently uprooted and scattered; the apostles Peter and Paul were sacrificed to a mystery of iniquity; the Churches founded by the apostles were overrun with doubtful and perilous speculation, and undermined by bad spirit; and the visions of the Hebrew seers were apparently extinguished in hopeless disappointment. It might reasonably have been supposed that the end of the world had come, that the hope of the Gospel was a fond illusion, that the Church of the living God had been a huge failure.

When the Imperial system bade fair to substitute a tyrannous secular despotism in place of the spiritual authority of the Church, and again, when Christendom awoke to find itself "Arian," and again, when the barbarians descended upon the Churches and the centralized power of the Roman empire, when Donatists and Catholics were alike swept away from North Africa, when the false prophet and the triumphant champions of Islam trampled under their feet the sanctuaries, the literature,

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

and institutions of the Oriental Churches, when the corruptions of the Papal system and of the religious orders threatened to engulf all Christianity in a common ruin, the broken-hearted prophet may with reason have said, the shadow has gone back on the dial-plate of time, we have been fed upon illusions, and have followed a deceitful *ignis fatuus*, no divine light or life has yet appeared to guide the nations. But wisdom has been justified; the kingdom of God has been steadily advancing, the divine life has deserted forms and systems which had done their work, but it has found new forms and new methods of expression. In many of these great crises in the history of the world there was very little that was calculated to reveal the inner unity of the life of the children of God. Opposition, antagonism, and exaggeration of existing divergences of doctrine and discipline were the passion of the hour. If we may judge by the most extreme sections of visible Christianity, much of the same temper is still conspicuous; but there is one hopeful feature in these days of anarchy and unrest, it is that almost all sections of the Church, and all forms of philosophical thought, are becoming so conscious of the peculiar "note" by which they are distinguished, that the nobler minds among them think that everything in the present aspect of affairs points to the ultimate victory of the peculiar principle with which they are severally identified. We all know well the reiterated chuckle of Rome that all changes of polity, and discussions of dogma, and shiftings of party and nations, are working out the deep designs of Providence, and the ultimate triumph of the Holy Roman See. But Anglicanism is just as confident of the reunion of Christendom on a totally or fundamentally different basis. The devout friends of the National Establishment say to Dissenters, everything proves that you are preparing to come back to the mother from whom you have so foolishly departed. Presbyterianism sees in its system the true *via media* between extreme sacerdotalism and Congregationalist anarchy, and glories in the adoption of its principles by the rival systems of Church Government which surround it. The Congregationalist, who believes deeply in the free scope allowed by his principles to the power of the Holy Ghost, and who sees the development—even in the

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

highest section of the Anglican Church, as well as elsewhere —of the combination of ecclesiastical freedom with congregational autocracy, cannot be treated to “unextinguishable laughter” if he too holds that everything is tending towards the full development of the great principle peculiar to him. The philosophical schools of religious thought are not exempt from this infirmity of fond hope. We know that the Positivist makes the ultimate victory of his theory of human life one of the prime articles of his faith. Even modern Judaism tells us that all the world will rest ultimately in the bosom of its grand and simple monotheism, and that the two sisters, the two children of Judaism, Christianity and Islam, will once more recognize in Jerusalem the fountain-head and sacred home of all their noblest inspirations.

Visionary as any one of these speculations may be, they prove in their combination that there is visible to every thoughtful eye in the manifestations of the divine life of man much which proclaims the unity of its origin, the grandeur of its source, the coming on of its triumph. The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God.

In conclusion, we are disposed to ask whether the unity of the life of those who are born again can be found in a general agreement among differently constituted minds to accept as true, to yield an assent, real or notional, to propositions concerning the eternal realities, which no man can definitely or scientifically prove? We think the true answer is an emphatic negative. Unity of assent will be secured in the region of ascertained fact; but so long as the mind is trying to convert notional assent to keen speculation or hypothesis into a real and irrevocable assent to absolute reality, to exalt intuitions of some minds into the standards of rectitude and truth for other minds who have no such intuitions, there may be a large amount of formal resemblance, but there can be no real unity. In all that deep region of thought where intuitions, tastes, affections, dispositions, and character play so large and necessary a part, *diversity* is the test of progress, and the help to progress. It is scarcely possible to conceive of any absolute union of expression for these deep realities which will not destroy the

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

essential nature of the most precious assent. None but the Infinite Mind can have before it all the aspects of truth, and the fundamental distinctions of powers and function and position will for ever prevent different minds from having the same intuitions. Gazing from varying altitudes and from opposite sides of the shores of the glassy sea before the throne of God, Bernard and Abelard, Francis and Dominic, Boehmen and Bunyan, Hooker and Cartwright, Arminius and Calvin, Anselm and Tauler and Luther, will have some thoughts and intuitions, some irresistible assents, which are all true, but which those who frame them cannot personally interchange. They will, however, recognize the fact that their brother's eyes are alike open to the vision of God, and, forgetting all their differences, will blend their voices in one eternal song.

Is, then, unity of organization desirable? Will a visible order be necessary to secure the true recognition of the common life? We believe that the idea is hopelessly impossible. The family bond, the human heart, and the individual life perpetually demolish the ghastly attempts at community of family relations which have been made in both the Old and the New World. Nationality is always breaking up great world dominions. By the side of the centralization of great monarchies and federations, and the dreams of universal empire, a disintegrating force which is true, natural, divine, has been actively at work, and so every religious order, every community, every Church of Christendom, has been, by an inevitable law, constantly resolving itself into its elements. The visible organization has its function, and when free to develop itself is full of unspeakable blessing; but it is essentially local, temporary, transitory in its nature. Like every other body, it must die; but the spirit, the life, is immortal.

Without unity of dogmatic utterance, without unity of organic form, there is abundant room for the true unity, the absolute oneness of the visible Catholic Church. Wherever the divine life manifests itself in the relations between man and man, there is the manifestation, there is the visibility we are in search of. The unity between the Father and the Son was not one of visible corporeity. The revelations of the Father and the revelations of the Son to the world have been in the

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

might and unity of the same Spirit, but not identical in form, or matter, or function. Our Saviour's prayer was "that they all might be one, even as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they all may be one in Us." The highest unity possible on earth, and perhaps in heaven, is the common, reciprocal recognition of the divine life.

There are signs of this blessed unification of the Church of God. Even those who officially are pledged to mutual anathema, now know that they are brothers of the same Lord, children of the same Father, heirs of the same glory, and they are not afraid to say so. In the burning furnace of famine, pestilence, shipwreck, war,—the children of faith, who never knew each other before, have lost their bonds, and they have survived the fiery trial. One like unto the Son of God has been seen ministering to each one of them, and in the New Jerusalem which is even now coming down from heaven from God, the smell of fire has passed away.

ART AND RELIGION.

"Also the singular diligence of the artificer did help to set forward the ignorant to more superstition."—BOOK OF WISDOM.

ART, the language of form and colour ; Religion, the belief of mankind about unseen and superior Being,—a belief controlling the will, inspiring emotion, moulding the character, urging to action,—what has been, what is, what should be the relation between them ? To exercise the one is a universal impulse ; the other is the most powerful of the influences that rule the mind and heart ; and the two will certainly have come into intimate association. Religion will have found in Art large and manifold means of expression ; Art will have received from Religion an inspiring motive, and a definite direction. Each will have been modified by contact with the other. We desire to point out the nature of this interaction in the past, as alternately developing and degrading both Art and Religion ; and to glance at the limitations that a spiritual Religion must impose upon the Art that serves it.

In confining ourselves to Art in its relations with form and colour, we exclude Music and Poetry, since these would enlarge and complicate the question we wish to discuss. Representative Art is a field distinct in itself, and of quite sufficient extent. This function of Art we have called a language, and the term may require a little explanation. It is so, in the view we wish to present of it, as thought clothing itself in material form ; a mode of utterance addressed to the eye, instead of to the ear—a writing, though not with arbitrary symbols. The art of the painter, the sculptor, the architect, what else is it

but a means of expression,—a silent but eloquent rendering of ideas? More explicitly, Art implies a perception of the symbolic expressiveness of form and colour, and seeks to set forth this perception, working according to its insight.

Since, however, the forms, and colours, and materials of the external world supply the means of this utterance, and since, too, form and colour are in themselves pleasurable, Art is often regarded as the result of an imitative faculty alone. Yet the imitation has always been subservient to expression. It has always been selective, and in this its true value has been felt to consist. The more it is an embodiment of individual thought and feeling, and imbued with what we may call the moral qualities of nature's work, the higher is the place assigned to it in Art. Imitation, where imitation has been closest, has been the expression of an inward delight in the thing imitated, and for the sake of a repetition and conveyance to others of the agreeable sensation it awoke in the observer. Art is indeed an exercise of that creative faculty which belongs to him who was formed in the image of the Divine Creator. In every manipulation of material things he has been always creating; but especially when he has been developing for himself the ideas of symmetry, beauty, majesty, mystery, which he finds in nature—when he has been composing a work of art.

In Architecture, imitation is less obvious than in other branches of art, and a building worthy of the name approaches more nearly a work of creation. The architecture of the heavens or the earth is not imitable, or adaptable to human needs. The constructions of animals are seldom more than shapeless accretions, ruled by no conceptions of order or beauty. The palace, the temple, the tomb, rose pure expressions of human thought, moulded not only to the wants, but to the ideal requirements of men.

Through this Art function it has been that the conceptions, the thick coming fancies and beliefs of men respecting the invisible world,—spirits above and beneath, the gods that rule, the dead that live, that which has been, that which shall be in the ages of eternity,—have especially found shape and substance. They have been crystallized in Art; by means of it they are encrusted over the surface of the earth. The ruins

strewn over all lands speak the impalpable thought of their peoples upon these matters. Every vacant fane, every violated tomb, almost every carved or painted fragment, belongs to the photograph left by the spiritual light that was in them. When and how did this process begin?

At the very outset we meet with that oddity the Idol—odd because not only an object of art, but an object of worship. It is the most pointed instance of the association of Art with Religion, and a problem every way. Was the Idol born of Art. Or did Art find the Idol, a shapeless lump, a log, a stone, and by slow degrees invest it not only with the semblance of life, but with beauty and moral expression? The question can only be fully answered by pursuing the much larger questions of the primæval condition of man, and the rise and progress of civilization. We can only indicate their bearing upon our subject.

The most natural origin of the Idol would seem to be the Fetish. Justly possessed as we are with an invincible conviction of development, a rude and simple condition always suggests itself as an initial stage of things; and when we find a piece of wood, or some formless natural object, invested with supernatural properties, when it seems in some inexplicable way to conceal a personality, it is easy to imagine that here is the inception of the Idol. Once accepted as instinct with mysterious life, it would only remain for Art to express this belief by adding form and colour, till, wrought with increasing skill, the goggle eyes, the grinning mouth, would gradually give place to lines of dignity and grace, and the Idol stand forth at last a magnificent Immortal. Yet, in the judgment of some of the strongest advocates of development, Fetishism, although the earliest indication of religious instinct, has no connection with idol worship. It is not in their view a recognition of Deity, but rather a species of witchcraft, a notion of a certain something in the inert substance constituting it a charm or amulet; or, at the most, whatever of divinity might be inherent in the thing, was thereby placed at the command and service of the possessor; bound to his bidding by the cord which suspended it from his neck, or by the nail that fastened

it to his wall. According to an eminent writer of this school,* Totemism, which reverences special animals or plants as guardians of deceased ancestors, was the dark beginning of worship; Shammanism, or the belief in invisible superior spirits who take possession of the wizard, was a further stage; while the Anthropomorphism, which looks upon the gods as a race of more powerful men, a still later stage, first gave rise to idol representation. This progression is plausible, but it cannot be traced connectedly and chronologically. The Anthropomorphists, for instance, show no indication of having once been Shammanians; nor the Shammanians of having formerly been given to Totemism; nor the Totem worshippers of having at some time doted upon the Fetish. The very names, uncouth as they are, belong to three separate continents,—Africa, the home of the Fetish, America of the Totem, and Siberian Asia of the Shamman. These diversities would rather appear dependent upon qualities of race, acting upon one and the same idea, common to human nature everywhere,—that of a Personality existing outside of or alongside mankind; more or less superior to it, and more or less associated with material objects. Fetishism, a low and rude shape of this conviction, is specially appropriated by a race of low national type, and to whom physical and other circumstances have long denied opportunities of improvement; but it is a tendency showing itself everywhere, and constantly drawing down more intellectual faiths to its own level. The sacredness of plants and animals is fetishistic; the believers in spiritual possession believe also in sacred stones, and in the Los, or sacred bit of squirrel skin; while the Idol, as we shall see, always becomes a Fetish.

And Fetishism may even spring from a system absolutely opposed to it. The founder of Buddhism, abjuring priest and idol, and all tangible approaches to the Deity, and bringing the religious life, and the highest spiritual exaltation, within the reach of all, became himself a Fetish to his followers. His lofty teaching raised the teacher, in their eyes, into an emanation of divinity, and this semblance of an Incarnation sufficed to supply the germ of Fetishism. For hence the preciousness of

* Sir J. Lubbock, "Origin of Civilization."

but a single hair, or tooth, or nail, of Buddha. Hence tope and temple, erected to conserve the relic possessing a secret virtue, and a miracle-working influence. Here indeed is an instance of Art in association with Fetishism, but not of Art growing out of the Fetish, in the sense supposed. The Art was in existence already, and already capable of grandeur of conception and exquisite execution. It was entirely architectural, expressing in towering height, and in costliness and beauty of detail, the intense reverence of the builders for the object enshrined; and in the central crypt, and its mystery of darkness, the sense of a hidden and mysterious virtue. It was an intellectual race, far other than the negro, that capable of exalted ideas of the divine nature, and gifted with perceptions of beauty, as well as powers of construction, thus raised topes, temples, and the vast convent courts surrounding them, for purposes, ultimately, of a gross Fetish worship. It degraded them, and corrupted their art; an art we may say that found not its birth, but its death, in Fetishism.

For again, as bearing upon the question of the origin of either Religion or Art in Fetishism, it should be remarked that this gross instinct is essentially a barren, infertile soil. If we look at it in its supposed primitive condition, it is associated with the lowest and most brutal forms of human existence, showing no germs of intellectual life; and when it appears among higher and more advanced races, it accompanies, as we shall have further opportunity of showing, the latter stages of a degraded Religion, and operates to the decay of Art, as of other intellectual products. In the one case, there is nothing of the energy of development about it; in the other, development has reached its acme, and its forces are daily declining. Can we then believe that it was ever the fountain of religious ideas; or the source of the inspiration of Art? Has development, however indubitable in human history, sprung from this root, and taken this course? It is a process of which indeed we see the results, but which it is most difficult to trace in action. Races die, and their gifts dwindle and perish with them; every impulse of intellectual power seems not only to work itself out, but to do so through misuse and abuse. No one race shows continuous progress, but

performs its part for a while, loses its vigour, and falls out of the course. The next impulse comes from some otherwise gifted race, emerging from unfathomable obscurity. It would seem as if a fount of creative energy were continually springing up afresh in the world to replace springs that have run dry. There is development, but its secret is not yet disclosed.*

Yet surely a ray of light shining as in a dark place gleams from the records of that people from whom, according to the flesh, Christ came. Such records may well be called sacred, and the slender fragments that relate to the earliest state of mankind may well claim reverent attention. What is the sort of representation they offer? It may be sufficient as general pictorial truth—true as a representation,—and yet not possess the truth of a scientific record; just as the blue heavens may be adequately apprehended as an overspreading canopy of azure, while to the eye of science they are simply systems of reflections of the solar light from floating atoms in the atmosphere. Yet to most of us the blue sky is a sufficient fact, and so too, to most of us, the sublime anthropomorphism of Genesis, picturing the Divine Will in operation, according to a purpose, upon primæval elements, is also sufficient. With respect to the question just before us, we all know that the kind of development it depicts is not that of a low animalism, successively adopting conceptions each a little less gross than the preceding; but rather that of a dignified but simple nature, advancing in complexity and variety of function, and opening thereby, alas, various avenues of degradation and ruin. There is the man living upon the fruits of the earth indeed, but no mere sensual savage; and there are germs of evil enough to account for any eventual degeneracy.

* There is no evidence to show that the different ages of men denominated the Palæolithic, the Neolithic, the Bronze, and the Iron, were, excepting the two last, different conditions of the *same* people. On the contrary, the first seem to have disappeared, or migrated, along with the mammoth, musk sheep, cave hyæna, and great bear, under great physical changes that took place. The second, the Neolithic, are marked off by a comparatively very advanced state of civilization. The third, there is good reason to believe, were Iberians, and these it is pretty certain were driven from most of their ground by invading Celts from the east. The indications all point to a progressive substitution of a higher for a lower race, not to the progression of a single race.

ART AND RELIGION.

Gathering up these hints, we may pause before accepting the Fetishism of the savage as (though the lowest) either the earliest, or the root religious notion of the human mind. It gives evidence of being a disease of religious life, rather than a living germ; a noxious weed, rather than the seed of truth,—a view which the whole course of our remarks will tend to confirm. Were it otherwise, however, it is pretty clear that Religious Art had no such base origin; it did not spring from the Fetish. The sacred stone or log was always sacred for its mysterious self, and preferred for its very formlessness;—the tool would spoil it. The idol reached its pedestal by far different steps, and from a far removed region of thought.

The connection between Art and Religion may be more surely traced to symbolism; to the desire to express, to record, to exemplify ideas respecting unseen power, and its relations to man. These ideas would first crystallize themselves in poetry and legend. Words and song were naturally the vehicles through which admiration, veneration, adoration, were first expressed; and it may be that the very necessities of early forms of speech helped to give personality to natural phenomena, and that the poetic spirit devised for them appropriate dramatic action, till a crowd of separate entities took possession of the imagination; or it might be that the spectacle of physical forces in conflict, or allied, encircling and moulding human destiny, had impressed the primæval mind with the notion of awful personal agents abroad in the world; or, again, that deceased great ones of mankind passed into the heavens, and still held to rule the destinies of their people, took form as mighty powers; or, again, that the various functions of a great Supreme, extolled in vivid figure, and told in parable, at last separated themselves from the original majestic but nebulous centre, and obtained independent being; or that the grand appearances of nature, adopted as emblems of the One Invisible, hints of whose presence were spoken of by the fathers, shaped themselves in like manner into distinct divinities. The obscurity of a very early dawn rests on the origin of ideas that supplied the first pabulum for poetry, as afterwards for art. But they were of a noble sort—the great

ART AND RELIGION.

movements of nature through the day and year; the great forces, Beneficences and Terrors, that seem to lie behind them; the great souls that came from the unknown, and departed thither; the great natural emblems of the One Unseen;—whichever stream of thought predominated, or however they might all be mingled and confused, there resulted a magnificent awe-inspiring region of the supernatural for the imagination to explore, and for poetry to body forth.

Poetry, and perhaps Philosophy, did their work, and then Art, servant to both, began to portray and shape to the eye the creatures of imagination, the conceptions of philosophy—to grave them upon the rock, to blazon them in colour, and by slow degrees, and various device, to set forth the gods in mimicry of men. It was a great field for Art; and it is easy to see how the legend, or the doctrine, while it lost in spiritual or poetic truth and beauty, would gain in reality and power, especially with the multitude; how the heretofore shadowy beings of the imagination, or the similitudes of speculation, cut by the cunning chisel in strange portentous shapes upon the wall, would presently impress beholders as facts, instead of fictions, and gradually attract a sacred awe; how still more, when the symbol or memorial, by the advancing skill of Art, was rounded into an actual bodily figure,—moulded in clay, or carved out of wood,—it would become invested with a secret local life and presence; how, at last, the fatal fetishistic influence would spread like a miasma round itself and its habitation.

But it is this ultimate union of the Idol with the Fetish, as well as the earlier and contemporaneous existence of fetish objects, that renders it difficult to distinguish the separate origin of the former. Mr. Baring Gould puts the distinction between the two concisely thus: "An Idol is a likeness or representation, more or less exact, of an idea; but a Fetish is a concentration of spirit or deity upon one point."* Upon this distinction we wish to lay all stress, but at the same time to urge with equal force that the Idol invariably becomes a Fetish. This might not be the case while the representative figure—the original "eidolon"—was only incised and coloured, or cut in low relief upon the face of rock, the wall of a house or tomb, implements

* "Origin and Development of Religious Belief."

ART AND RELIGION.

and utensils ; but would inevitably occur when detached as an image ; for then it would become not only a representation, but an *object*, the essential distinction of a Fetish. The original intention of the Idol has, however, enabled its more enlightened advocates, such as the intelligent Brahman quoted by Max Müller, to justify its adoption, and deny its fetish worship. The criterion may be found in the various degrees of sanctity and power attributed to different images representing the same personality or principle. If one, more than another, is resorted to as peculiarly influential, it is that it is so much more of a Fetish. We know well that this sort of feeling attaches to all idols, as well as to images not called by that name ; and where it is so, the intention of the Fetish, which is to obtain a present deity, is fulfilled.

It was Art, then, that invented the Idol. It was a thing of civilization, an intellectual product, and so far superior, not only to pure Fetishism, but to the simple worship of the noblest natural emblems. Art wedded an intellectual conception to a gross instinct, and so doing illustrates the perpetual danger that attends both art and civilization—the serving of the flesh rather than the spirit. It is to the idol, however, that we owe one of the grandest achievements of Art—the Temple.

The mere Fetish did not require housing. It was either cherished as a personal chattel, or as an object of nature left in its natural state. And the early Aryan races were not temple builders : “ They would have thought it impious to rear with human hands a house for the one Great Spirit of the universe, whose manifestations were nothing meaner than the sun and planets, and whose emblem on earth was fire, the most subtle of visible things.”* The Teutonic tribes, as described by Tacitus, “ thought that to confine the gods within walls, or to represent them in the image of man, was unworthy of the greatness of heavenly beings.” In Thibet, again, where they possess a living God, there are no temples. No, it was essential that some material shape should represent the god before the house that should contain him could be built. The transition must be accomplished from the living Invisible to the lifeless

* “ Ferguson’s History of Architecture.”

visible, and again from the representative to the fetishistic image; and then arose the temple. Of these buildings it is probable the immediate precursors were the regal or public edifices, such as those the Assyrian excavations have disclosed, filled with the earlier symbolic representations.* It was the image, the later product of Art, and the public or royal property for which the temple was prepared; and it was this, the Idol, that ruled the entire construction. It dwelt in the innermost recess, to which court after court admitted the favoured worshipper, reverence heightening with every step, while in the sacred heart of the building darkness shrouded and spread mystery around the momentous object itself; as if, after all, the subject of such tremendous pretensions—wood or marble, carved, gilded, painted, as it might be—would be too bare and hard a fact to submit to the light of day in its dull and wooden impotence. So, cabined, cribbed, confined, the tremendous thing sat secret, a thing that must not be looked upon save by its ministers, its oath-bound servants, pledged to its dreadful service.

For of necessity the idol and the temple demand a priesthood. The priest might exist before, but the official and dignified order would belong to a temple service. What sovereign without his court, his high officers of state, his guards and chamberlains? And so, when the object that held a god sat upon its throne, its high estate was girt about with all the pomp of priesthood, thronging courts, and corridors and cells; and the temple ever grew in precinct, and in splendour. So the walls were glorified, as in the palace of a king, with ever-fresh device, endlessly recording the god's exploits; till his history, and ever more and more of it, was unrolled before the eyes of the multitude, and wrought itself into their thoughts, and moulded their very lives. So every stone of the fabric became sacred, every slab was sanctified that met the shoeless foot; and to a far distance towers, obelisks, and pylons shone in the wide landscape, marking the spot where that *thing* was.

Art that had reared the fane round the image it had wrought, and with brush and chisel garnished the walls, elaborating the

* Sir J. Lubbock observes that the kingly state seems always to have preceded the idol. "Origin of Civilization."

history of the god, and so in a gross sense, tabernacling him in flesh, developed a worse evil. These histories might in the first instance depict phenomena of nature, or embody theories of existence, which might be pure as poetry, profound as science or philosophy. But it is easy to see that when such were translated into the symbols of Art—an art direct and crude,—when the mysterious sources and processes of life, sacred in themselves, grand in the myth, were put before the eye in more than nature's nakedness, they would become obscene; and wall and frieze, covered with foulness, would corrupt morality, instead of teach philosophy. The mere touch of Art in this matter was sufficient to defile, and could not but defile;—it did defile.

Moreover, these halls of art became habitations of cruelty. Gay colours were upon the walls; music and dancing filled the corridors; but the smell of blood was in them. To the bodily presence of the Deity bodily service was appropriate, and infinite ceremonial distinguished times and seasons, days and hours, in unceasing round. Under all this, the lusts of the body found evil place. But not this only. The ineradicable instincts of the heart demand expiation; pain, nay life itself, must pay for sin, or must placate the vengeful powers created by fear. The knife, the knife!—pour out the life-blood—let the pangs of the body atone for the sin of the soul; let the young and the innocent expire in their gore; let the smoke of the consuming victim cling around the legs and salute the nostrils of the dim, impassive image that sits above—an image that has come to represent some implacable aspect of nature, some demon fancy of the soul; and in its terrible contour is itself an incarnation of cruelty. Not that the image alone is responsible for all this. The altar was no doubt older than the image, and there were horrors of the grove before those of the temple. But Art formulated and systematized the rude atrocities of the forest, and worked them into the midst of splendid civilizations. Art reduced them into exact and periodical ceremonial; and dignified them by the grandeur of the temple, and intensified them by the presence of the Idol.

Yet Art could not have done all this without materialized conceptions to work upon. These were in a degree supplied

ART AND RELIGION.

to it from the first, and then itself powerfully helped on the process of materialization. In the ignorance of nature's processes, every movement was attributed to an immediate and local force; and in the consciousness of human will as a constant spring of action, a will immediate, arbitrary, and perhaps capricious, was seen in every exercise of force—the will of some Being, occult, but living, whose unseen arm wielded the lightning, whose breath was in the breeze. In the inability again to conceive of spirit, a corporeity, though not necessarily visible, was always supposed; while in ignorance of the cosmos, earth was the home alike of gods and men. Art needed all this anthropomorphism, and attained its fullest development only where it was most vividly apprehended. But it was thus by means of Art that polytheism, which had been gradually forming itself in the thoughts, became definite and local. The image multiplied the Deity at every repetition and every caprice of the sculptor's chisel or painter's tool. While each diverse image, assuming fetishistic power, ruled the country side in proportion to its credit or the pomp of its fane. Art rendered polytheism from an idea into a fact.

This leads us to consider some of the modifications which race, and period, and scene effected upon Religious Art. Egypt, Assyria, India, Greece, worked in various manners, each of them influenced by national characteristics, by physical conditions, and by the religious conceptions which these had a hand in moulding. It is too integral a portion of our subject to omit, while yet it is too large and complex for the space we can afford to it here.

In the great monumental land of Egypt, Religious Art has left a more enduring and majestic record than anywhere else; and there is no more striking instance of the educating influences of landscape and material. Its architecture is intensely local, breathing the very spirit of Nile scenery. The solemn simplicity reigning in the one, rules also in the other. To the wide expanses, the long ranges of treeless rock, the sand mounds, and the changeless sunlight; the pyramid, the pylon, the obelisk, the colossal sphinx, are fit companions. In the level flatness of Egypt's valley, guarded by mountains and

besieged by deserts, the hard rock was the great instructor, and the Egyptian wrought with congenial massiveness. His ideas were always akin either to mountain accumulation or to rock excavation; nay, so cavernous, so capacious, so massive were his works, that he might have derived his types from some under-world; to have built first for night, and then for day; first for the dead, and then for the living. And in truth it was the under-world that ruled in Egypt, and made it above all others the land of the Tomb.

The connection between the religion of a people, and their ideas of a future life, is very close. The latter give momentousness to the former. The man living and breathing upon the solid earth, and in the bright day, may feel indeed dependent upon unseen Power, especially in circumstances of stress and peril; but still his own energies are strong within him, and the visible world surrounds him with its comfortable shelter. Night strips him of this shelter, paralyzes his energies, and he is immediately surrendered to the Unseen—the powers to whom darkness is no obstacle, and with which his imagination peoples the black vacuity around. But the darkness of night is nothing to that of death, when, a naked, shivering ghost, driven from his house of clay, he must enter the very realm itself of those awful Powers, and be dealt with as they list. With this future before him, his relations with the Lords of that world are of infinite importance; and his religion is a mighty fact. None seem to have dwelt so persistently upon the problems of the after-life as the Egyptian. Hades was the great theme of the national mind, upon which it spent its powers, to which it dedicated its greatest monuments and its choicest art.

Impressed with a notion of the future life that was extraordinarily vivid, but narrow and grossly material, they hung about the deserted body, labouring to fortify it against decay. For this, with spices and costly care they tended it, wrapped, adorned, encased, and painted it; and finally, having constructed for it a chamber in a pyramid, or a house in the rock, they conveyed it to the everlasting habitation, where, after the lapse of three thousand years, the returning soul seeking might find its ancient tenement intact, and peacefully awaiting the far-

ART AND RELIGION.

travelled spirit. Thus a vast city of the dead arose beside each city of the living; ever portentously enlarging its boundaries, as each passing generation added to the silent multitude. Kings departed thither, gathered to their fathers in a sense we cannot appreciate, each reposing in his death-palace. There the various ranks and orders of their subjects took up their separate state; there the inferior crowd assembled; there even the dead gods were piled in thousands—bulls, and birds, and beasts innumerable, till the empire of death visibly outnumbered that of life; and life itself, and the busy daylight, were obviously but the short vestibule to the Hades whose ramparts and gloomy gates overhung the living city.

Who shall say how much this constant dwelling in the very presence of the myriad dead weighed down and darkened the Egyptian mind? Who can adequately estimate the influence of sepulchral art in its unceasing efforts to dignify the tomb, to adorn the tomb, to portray all the ceremonial of funeral, to depict the state of the dead, in materializing the convictions of the popular mind as to the unseen state? It necessarily helped, if it did not produce, an earthward tendency, debasing the spiritual truth of which there are indications they were originally possessed.

For in Egypt pictorial art was, at least in its origin, far less anthropomorphic than symbolic; and the symbols, composed of incongruous animal forms,—wings, and horns, and snakes, the heads of rams, hawks, and the like, attached to human bodies,—seem to have been intended to express ideas more spiritual than physical. We can read in their original intention something of the many-sidedness of a great creative Intelligence—wise, powerful, beneficent, and protecting; and can believe that we behold in them hieroglyphs of truth. Yet it must be observed that the art was of a low type. It was little better than picture writing, or the use of conventional emblematic signs. To adopt a ram's head as a symbol of intelligence from the prominence of its forehead; to fix it upon a human trunk coloured blue, this colour denoting the celestial ether; and by such composite monstrosity to set forth Divine Intelligence, argues very poor imaginative and executive power. The result indeed is scarcely within the domain of Art. In sculp-

ART AND RELIGION.

ture they succeeded better. Their monsters gained sublimity by repose and size; and the sphinx, solemnly gazing onward to the eternity she challenges, deserves to be the riddle of the world.

Yet if Egyptian Symbolic Art was originally the handmaid of Truth, she became servant to a lie. A degeneracy is disclosed from the grand conceptions of the concealed God, the creative God, the life-generating God, and others of like greatness, to the multitude of derivative gods and goddesses, more distinctly associated with aspects of nature, and which the ingenious chisel delineated in infinite variety, down to the Osiris legends which belong to the mud of the Nile. But a perversion more direct and fatal followed in the animal worship which besotted the Egyptian mind. So gross a thing puzzled both Greeks and Romans, who supposed it derived either from cognizances on helmets, or from figures of animals displayed on standards. In this art derivation they were not far wrong. It pretty certainly lay in the sacred hieroglyph. If the jackal, adopted as the symbol of watchfulness, became associated with a certain divinity, it was soon looked upon as a sacred animal, and eventually, under the care of a sodality of priests, and consigned to the courts of a temple, became the object of fetishistic worship. Bird and beast, reptile and fish, crowded the walls of tomb and palace in every mythologic picture; and bird and beast, reptile and fish, taking place of the thing signified, cumbered houses, temples, tombs, with their presence as fetishistic divinities. They were pleasant to them in their lives, and in death they were not divided.

It will be observed that this symbolic art did not result in the idol-image, but in the idolized animal; a very curious and unique development, indicative perhaps of the fact that art was thoroughly subservient to the priest, and that he held doctrines more subtle than art could explain. Be this as it may, the art of Egypt was a priestly art. It was not a spontaneous exercise of the national mind, but an organized means to an end, rigidly bound by conventionalism. Egypt exhibits the earliest, completest specimen of a priesthood, and it held the world in admiration and awe for ages. The king was always either a priest born, or he was enrolled among the priests at his accession,

and was thus identified with their order—a fact which the construction of the great temples illustrates, for temple and palace generally compose one vast building, which being also a fortress, was the stronghold at once of the civil, the priestly, and the military power—the completest union of Church and State. A primitive priesthood seems generally to have implied a distinct and more intelligent race, and the especial guardianship and ministry of knowledge. All the power, therefore, conferred by knowledge was theirs; so also that of organization, isolation, union; more than all, that of their position as interpreters and guides of the highest aspirations and most secret longings of the human soul.

This ministry these Egyptian priests seem to have originally fulfilled. A true and noble aristocracy in birth, education, and manners, they aspired to present the highest model of human nature; as those who lived nearest the divine, by purity inward and outward. Shaven bodies, frequent ablutions, temperance, a dress of spotless white linen, distinguished their order. Theoretically, their institution embraced the noblest objects, and met a lasting need—mediation between God and man. If their rule was a despotism, there was much to justify it; so that of all priestly bodies none was ever comparable to that of Egypt for duration, domination, and repute of wisdom. These were the men who had brought away, probably from some Asiatic centre, the germs of sciences and arts, and the more priceless treasure of religious truth. *They were the fathers of Religious Art*—of its glory and of its shame. In architectural magnificence and solemnity of conception none have surpassed them, and none have equalled them in putting legend, myth, and science in bright colours on the wall. But that it was the art of a class, and used according to fixed rules and for fixed ends, was fatal to whatever truth it conserved—fatal also to itself. It expired under the rigour of conventionalism. As picture, it never advanced beyond the attenuated gaily coloured silhouette, in endless repetition of attitude; as sculpture, beyond a formal but majestic repose; as architecture, after reaching the highest impressiveness that weight, mass, simplicity, and imposing arrangement could bestow, it rapidly degenerated under the general debasement of thought. In fact, possessing

as they did the emblematic symbol, the hieroglyphic secret, the mythologic legend, and all the machinery of the grave, this priesthood educated the Egyptian mind only to debase it. They were conservators, not disseminators of truth. That gift, whatever they had of it, they hoarded to themselves, till it perished in their grasp. They enshrined only to degrade their sacred possession, and Art was their great instrument for turning a blessing into a curse.

Egypt in their hands became as one of the mummies they taught her to embalm; rigidly bound and swathed, painted and inscribed, a peaceful, amiable, harmless-looking object, but dead within; shrunken, dried, nerveless, juiceless, with a brain stuffed to order, and a heart of dust! It was the inevitable result of truth monopolized instead of diffused. Truth dies, imprisoned in the mephitic atmosphere of the temple; she lives only when given to the free, it may be the stormy winds, and allowed to expand her noble wings, to fly abroad through the earth, to alight in the humblest dwelling.

Assyria offers to us a more masculine spectacle. Here it is the royal figure, not the priestly caste, that stands foremost; and here war, the chase, life in all its energy, takes the place of funeral ceremonies, and the occupations of ghosts. It is a strong-limbed race, with thews of iron, that here fight, and hunt, and build, under the protecting care of Ormuzd and the stars of heaven. The lay element overpowers the priestly, and a distinctively religious art scarcely exists. The temple, as we have already noticed, is absorbed in the palace; but in the few instances where it stands alone, its character as a succession of terraces, lifted towards the shining heavens, and bearing aloft the colours of the celestial hierarchy, indicates a far more aspiring belief than was congenial to the Egyptian mind. These vigorous warriors could not demean themselves to animal worship—the animals they hunted and slew; though they used to some extent, but always in a grand manner, the symbols supplied by the animal world. Nor cared they to follow the departed spirit through the mazes of after-existence. Fire—keen, consuming, and aspiring—suited their conceptions better than any creeping thing of the earth, as an emblem of supernal power, and they infinitely preferred the daylight of

ART AND RELIGION.

life to the night of death. Their art faithfully reflects, and gains by this difference, which may be read even in the circumstance that action characterizes their figures rather than repose. Of their great god Belus it is significantly recorded that he was represented upright, and in the act of walking. They were too active a people to dwell upon the problem of existence, and to sink into the obscene and loathsome in dealing with that enigma. Yet it would appear that symbolic art led them also more and more away from the great natural emblems of their earlier faith into idol worship, as the clangour of "all kinds of music" before the golden statue on the plain of Dura sufficiently attests.

Indian Religious Art partakes of the jungle and its monsters. It is rich beyond compare, tropically rich, in clustering detail, in flamboyant ornament. It is elaborately symbolic; and here once more it is the priest or religious devotee, not the king, that is the prominent figure. But we must remember that its developments are all subsequent to the great eras of Egyptian or Assyrian art, and that it falls into two quite different streams. One of these, the Buddhist, and to which by far the grandest series of its monuments belongs, is not, as has already been pointed out, concerned with the idol at all, but with the relic; not with the priest, but with the monk. Architecturally, it took the form more of the monastery than the temple, in accordance with the contemplative character of the religious life inculcated. But the conservation of relics was its leading thought, and the cubic pyx, or chamber, which contained the precious object, gradually swelled into the dome-like edifice which marks the style; as the commemoration of miracles or other sacred events on the scene of their occurrence, led to the tope, or lofty columnar tower, which should point out the spot from afar. In sculpture, there was little more than the endless repetition of Buddha in one unvarying attitude. Of Brahmanical art, anterior to Buddhism, we have no remains; and in those subsequent, the Buddhist architectural forms were followed to a great extent. But Brahmanism is essentially polytheistic and idolatrous. Symbolic art runs riot in it, and ministers at last to the grossest superstitions and the lowest lusts. Anthropomorphic to a certain extent, it is associated with the utmost

extravagance and copiousness of emblematic representation, and sticks at no foulness. It has nothing of the stately solemnity of Egypt; nothing of the masculine dignity of Assyria; nothing of the graceful humanity of Greece. It haunts the mind like a disordered dream. The forest is its parent. Nowhere is the derivation of architectural forms from wooden originals more evident, and in the favourite "halls of a thousand columns" the crowded multitude of pillars seems to have been directly suggested by the tree-stems of the grove. Egyptian architecture is cavernous and massive as a stone quarry; Assyrian, is terraced like a hill-side in the plain; Indian, is the growth of a tropical woodland. Each pictures a region; each is moulded by a particular cast of religious thought.

What shall we say of Greece, fair mother of beauty? As she dealt with the ideas and myths of an older time and race in poetry, leading the noble and beautiful gods through a thousand and one adventures, which alternately charm and shock us to this day; so she dealt with them in Art, rendering them twice over immortal. In marble, ivory, and gold they stood forth, challenging the worship of the world for something other than divinity. More than anywhere else, the gods, from their exquisite human presentment, became real personages; more than anywhere else, land and sea were full of them, not as dark, occult spirits and powers, but as a social circle of superb intelligences, busy with the elements, busy amongst men; part rulers, part playmates of the people of their charge. To these Art gave an actuality of being that Poetry could not bestow. In brave and lovely forms they thronged the streets and markets. Their loves and their deeds danced along the walls; and the temple was a house in which symmetry and cheerful grace were the ruling characteristics; it was the beautiful house, where the image of the god thrilled more with the perfection of form than with the sense of a mysterious presence. No monsters glowered within; no symbolic extravagance puzzled the intellect and debased the taste.

True, there were compound forms, but they were such as Art could deal with. The centaur was a companionable creature; the fawn and the satyr were picturesque; and in

ART AND RELIGION.

these creations it should be remarked how much was due to the art that rendered a grotesque combination into an harmonious and possible shape which could live in the public eye, and justify itself by its successful presentment. But all this was an earthly glory in which the spiritual light was swallowed up and lost. Art became all in all. The beauty of the gods in sculptured form was everything; and necessarily, with the keener cultivated intellects, religion as a belief declined. We shall find it always so. Art cannot thrive where Religion is supreme. Religion dies if Art comes uppermost. But Art does not long survive. The worship of beauty in Greek art destroyed its dignity and purity, and, losing these, it became luxurious and sensual. The splendid human gods rushed into human lusts and passions, to which Art ministered by giving them living shape, corrupting all beholders. Nor was this the only source of the degradation of Art and the ruin of Religion; for again, as ever, the idol wrought its evil enchantments. The grovelling fetish spirit, from which Greece had been never free, crept round the personifications of Art, and gradually debased both artist and worshipper. Religion, such as it was, preferred the many-papped thing "that fell down from Jupiter"—the crude image that was chained and carried about, a thing of secret virtue and local power; and this paganism of the highest culture worked itself out into atheism, superstition, and sensuality.*

But it is time to halt. During all this play of Fancy, Philosophy, and Art, with the common truths of religion, something new was preparing for the world. We must turn to look at a unique form of Religious Art which was teaching its lesson in a corner midway between the east and the west, and whence suddenly a great light shone upon the nations. We have been glancing at forms of art that hardened and materialized the

* "When the significance of a symbol is forgotten, and the worship remains, the idol becomes a mere fetish, and then its symbolic character is perverted to gross ends."—Baring Gould, "Origin of Religious Belief," vol. i., p. 187.

ART AND RELIGION.

conceptions with which they dealt, and which in their poetic or philosophic dress had been nobler and more spiritual, if only from being more vague. We have seen Art defining to the eye that which Language had already defined to the thought, and so bringing in the Idol, and at last the Fetish. We have now to look at Art used for a while to reverse all this,—Art, which while it bodied forth the spiritual, was not to stand in place of the thing signified, but to educate towards its better understanding; and which should supply fitting moulds for thought and language in the future, rather than be itself the product of them.

This system of Religious Art purports to be of divine origin; and the fact that in the fulness of time such an one as “the Lord” appeared and claimed its teaching as pointing to Himself, justifies all Christians in believing it to have been so. Yet it must not be forgotten that even a divine art is a human instrument, and that a divine instruction by means of art must be such as the people addressed could understand. It must necessarily be an adaptation of forms already familiar to them. And, further, that if fitted to one stage of human progress, it may be unfitted to another; nay, that in proportion as it effects its purpose, its function may become obsolete.

In the Religious Art of the Hebrews, what first strikes us is the Tabernacle, that tent of darkness and mystery, wherein He that spreadeth out the heavens as a curtain, and as a tent to dwell in, would also condescend to dwell. Rich in the colours of its dyed skins, and of the blue and purple and scarlet of its fine linen; heavy with gold embroidery of mystic meaning, it stood a sanctuary of rude exterior, but solemn in its ample folds, amidst the host of God—moving as they moved, till it rested within the sacred land itself. It contained an inner sanctuary, shut off by curtains within curtains; it was surrounded by an outer court. Altars also were there,—a golden altar within, for the burning of sweet incense; a brazen altar without, for the burning of slain victims. So far, the religious ideas of that age were met. These were familiar forms. There must needs as yet be a place where God should be, a roof and walls, however strangely fashioned—a tent amidst other tents of a travelling people—that should

contain Him, whom the heaven of heavens could not contain. But this "place of His feet" was an empty place. The visible altar lacked a visible God. From the brazen altar without, rose the flame and smoke of the reeking slain; but behind appeared only the dark empty opening of the tent curtains. The odours of the golden incense altar ascended in the gloom within; but behind there fell only the impenetrable veil. The image of this God, was it then beyond the veil? No! concealed by its folds was a throne, and nothing more—a throne raised upon the chest that held memorials of the nation's history, and whereon the two wide-winged cherubim standing on either side, with faces inward looking, bent over the empty seat between. Nothing could be more suggestive of a Presence, but of a Presence only; nothing more impressively in harmony with that injunction: "Take ye good heed to yourselves; for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day the Lord spake unto you out of Horeb, out of the midst of the fire: lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image."* Nor was it even a perpetual Presence that was indicated, for it was not so much a "dwelling" for the Lord as a *meeting-place*. "There will I meet with thee;" "I will come down and talk with thee;" were the oft-repeated words of promise.

There was then, as part of the function of Art in this divine economy, the enclosing of a spot whither the Lord should come,—the construction of a place, *one* place, where the ordered worship should be offered. It was distinguished by all that Art could do with the simple materials of desert life in the way of richness of colour, costliness of material, and solemnity of aspect. Such a definiteness was needful for a people come out of such a land as Egypt. And such a definiteness was needed to express a truth of as yet far-off development. But there was only one such dwelling or meeting-place of the Lord, as the Lord was one, and as the whole land was the Lord's, and the earth the Lord's, and not this or that particular shrine. And, most significant of all, the whole construction of this sanctuary centered round an empty space. But the idol, though effectually excluded, was sorely missed.

* Deut. iv. 15, 16.

Over and over again the inextinguishable hankering after the visible representative of divinity broke out, though met by the sternest denunciations and judgments; nor was it cured till the last severity of conquest and captivity had come upon the people.

The Temple was far more a work of art than the tabernacle, but it was a less pure expression of the divine religion. Gentile hands helped in its construction, and Gentile ideas found place in conception and detail. The king, who imitated the state of other kingdoms in his palace, imitated (as how should he not?) the architectural forms of other temples in the building he devised, and, it is even supposed, followed the practice of other kings in erecting royal chambers as an upper story to this most sacred edifice. Nor without a special intervention, unusual in the divine procedure, could it be otherwise. But the spirit of the tabernacle ruled nevertheless. The architecture chiefly belonged to the surrounding courts and porches. The fane itself was sheathed in wood, giving it, as has been said, "the appearance of a rough log-house." Natural rock seems to have formed the floor of the Holy of Holies, and though a solid partition, and doors of olive-wood, divided it from the rest of the interior, yet a veil still hung in front of the doors. More than all, there was the awful vacuum which in the second temple struck Pompey with astonishment.

The emblematic bulls and lions in the outer edifice, afterwards condemned by the Jews themselves as contrary to the law, were art symbols borrowed apparently from the Tyrians; but there was one mystic symbol of earlier date, and of paramount authority, that of the cherubim, which was sanctioned in the original tabernacle. There they not only shadowed the ark with their wings, but were profusely worked in the embroidery of the hangings. This great religious emblem, a combination of zoological forms in which wings were the most imposing and significant member, seems to have been one of the earliest in religious art, and though always associated with the divine Presence, to have never superseded it. In no one instance is there a trace of its receiving idolatrous worship, and its thorough and universal recognition as a symbol only, apparently justified its original adoption in the

Mosaic tabernacle. If indeed, as seems likely, the cherubim typified the subserviency of all life and intelligence to the One Supreme, they would stand a perpetual testimony against idolatry, which their universal introduction in *pairs* would also tend to discourage.

It may be remarked that there was extraordinary majesty in the manner in which Solomon treated these emblems. Colossal in size, their vast wings stretched from wall to wall, the whole width of the sacred place, "shadowing the mercy-seat." Combined with the empty throne of the invisible Lord, the effect must have been in the highest degree impressive when on the yearly entrance of the high priest the veil was lifted, and the olive doors were thrust back. The two great pillars of the porch were clearly borrowed from neighbouring architecture, in which also the great outer courts even of the tabernacle had probably their prototype.

The whole of this system was, it is evident, entirely free from the idolatrous element; but it was impossible it should be without a fetishistic tendency. Nay, it might almost seem like a consecration of fetishism, as in a certain sense it was for a time and for a purpose. The first essential of the religious teaching of that nation and of the world, was the fact of an ever-present Deity, and yet of an invisible presence. By no other means of a material nature could this be done than by the consecration of a particular spot, and by surrounding it with all the circumstances that could generate awe. But besides this there was one special object, the ark, to which a fetishistic feeling did strongly cling, as was shown when the cry went up, "The ark of God is taken!" Yet the fact that it was taken, after having been brought to the battle as a palladium, was a rebuke to that feeling, and throughout, the dangerous sentiment was controlled and elevated. There was but one house of the Most High—every high place and darkling grove was an abomination; and the one most sacred object in tabernacle or temple was universally known to contain no vestige of divinity, but historical memorials and a written law that gave only the absolute conditions of human well-doing. The sacredness attached to these things was therefore not that of a true fetishism, which fondles a thing

ART AND RELIGION.

as actually encasing divinity, or as a bit of a god or saint, but the sacredness rather of an historical relic or memorial, a perpetual sign of the covenant which had been made with the fathers. And that this was the prevailing view is shown by a certain freedom in dealing with sacred things during the better periods of Hebrew history, very different from the grovelling awe of the true idolater.

But the great safeguard against idolatry or pure fetishism in the whole system lay in the noble order of prophets—those great lay-preachers of righteousness who, and *not* the priests, were the true messengers and expounders of the divine will to the people. These kept up a direct intercourse between man and God, not by means of symbol or ceremony, but by the living word; and in this grand ministry even a herdman of Tekoa stepped in front of the highest priestly functionary. With such voices ringing through the land, ever appealing to the spirit, and not to the letter, though many might yield to the seductions of foreign idol worship, or fall into a superstitious use of their own, a pure seed of the spirit was perpetuated from age to age.

For the divine scheme of worship was liable to perversion. Why should we hesitate to say so? Be it divine, yet the instrument was human, and those addressed were human, and as yet gross in their conceptions. What divine appointment is there that is not perverted to evil? Does not the whole creation groan under it? No wonder, then, that this high teaching by means of art and symbolism should end in that Pharisaism which is only a form of fetishism; which counts the letters of the law instead of apprehending its spirit; which binds it on the forehead rather than on the heart; which looks upon the stones of the temple, and the gold of the temple, rather than to Him who dwelleth therein; which makes the temple the seat of man's pride rather than the place of God's presence.

It was true, then, that this Art teaching, with all its solemn simplicity and emphatic meaning, could not make the comers thereunto perfect. It corrupted itself; it waxed old, and was ready to vanish away. It was part of a system which God winked at while He used it. In the fulness of time its func-

tion ceased. A divine breath passed over it, and it was gone. That Holy Place was indeed empty when the Lord walked forth amongst men ; that altar idle when the cross was lifted up ; that temple useless when "He spake of the temple of His body," and laid the foundation of that living temple of which the living stones are human souls. If a divine hand fashioned the temple symbolism, that same hand smote the altar, and rent the veil in twain. It had taught much ; it had foreshadowed much ; it had furnished ideas and terms to thought and language which could never perish ; and then the sublimest symbolism the world has ever seen was done with ! The temple stood in all the bravery of its golden colonnades when the words, "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth," pronounced its doom ; and with the pregnant sentence, "Wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," the spell was uttered that left it but a dream, a vision of that night upon which the day-spring from on high had risen.

If Christ came in the fulness of time, a new cycle then began. One series of *Æons* was completed, and something different must distinguish that which followed. Perhaps the most marked difference appeared in the individual character of the new dispensation. It was no longer a nation that was dealt with, but a Church, an association of individuals called to be saints, called one by one, and yielding personally to the call, each of them independent of outward relation, standing alone with God, and as a party to a personal, not a national covenant. The new King was Shepherd and Bishop of souls, and the care of the Shepherd was for each single wanderer called by name into the fold, and borne if need be in the faithful arms. No doubt the seed of that kingdom, which was now as a tender plant showing itself above the soil, had been sown long before in the individual soul life of Abraham, of David, and many others of the old time ; but now the spiritual plant, the true outcome of the spiritual husbandry, appears, and must reach maturity amidst all the conditions, adverse and otherwise, of the open air.

ART AND RELIGION.

In this, as we believe, lies the key to the right understanding of the history of Christianity. It must be regarded as a principle in continual conflict; and continually overcome for a time, or modified, by that which it encountered. Now its adversary, so far as the outside world was concerned, was Paganism, in which may be included that Jewish symbolic system which was the divine adaptation of paganism. Into the pagan world it was cast, a leaven, so gradually leavening the whole lump, that for ages the characteristics of the lump predominated,—perhaps they still predominate! The task of any observer of Christianity is to discriminate between the ever-working leaven and the mass in which it is seething. Following the single thread of Art in Religion, we should trace the influence both of the leaven and the lump.

But for a time Art is banished. A bare upper room in Jerusalem supersedes the temple; a Prophet, yea, One who is more than a prophet, supersedes the priest. The glory of the Lord shines no longer from between mystic emblems, amidst gold and purple and fine linen, nor flashes from a jewelled breast-plate, but beams forth in the words and acts of a marred and sorrowful man. The initial rite of the new religion is performed in streams and pools under the open sky; the most sacred of its ceremonies from house to house. Both are of the simplest and most inartistic character. The negation of Art is absolute. The key-note struck is, "That which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." Henceforth the outer courts of the temple are the open world of nature, and its inner sanctuary is the soul of man. It is plain that if Art is to find a legitimate place in connection with this religion, it must be on different grounds than heretofore, and in a different shape; and it is probable that in its first beginnings we shall trace something of its true function.

But for a long time Christianity had no room for Art. First, because of the intensity of the spiritual life, which could only utter itself through the purest spiritual medium—prophecy, psalm, and hymn. Again, because of the intimate association of Art with paganism, so that it was at first absolutely forbidden, and an artist was compelled to abjure his art before he could be baptized. Thirdly, because persecution closed in upon

the faith with sword and flame under which no art could live. When it did begin to show itself, it was in holes and corners, and was individual and memorial. It was a silent utterance of faith and hope underground, beside the grave of loved ones, or scratched on the walls of the catacomb sanctuary. Christian Art showed itself at first a tender floweret blooming faint and colourless, without light and air.*

Its great subject was the Son of Man; not, however, in the humility and suffering of His life on earth, nor yet in His majesty as King and Judge; but in His relations to the individual soul, or to the company of believers, or to the grave whose bars He had broken, or to the unseen world into which He had entered. Of course the rules of Art, as then understood, influenced the selection of subjects and the mode of treatment. Classic Art must introduce no repulsive forms, nothing inconsistent with repose and beauty; and so none but the gentler aspects of the Christian faith were represented. Still the absence of realism is remarkable. It is the character of the Redeemer, and His divine offices, that are dwelt upon; not His bodily presence, still less the literal horrors of His death. There was much symbolism, but it was of a simple hieroglyphic sort, a translation into the forms of art of the familiar types and figures of Scripture; so that the walls became a pictured Bible, where the history of the chosen nation was rendered into a series of allegorical presentments of the Gospel; and the slain yet triumphant Lamb, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the sheep, and above all the Shepherd, were set forth in endless variety of type. There was never such an isolation of any figure or symbol as would imply or lead to a fetishistic feeling about it, while, as the source and meaning of them were known to everybody, not the exclusive possession of a priestly class, an ignorant worship of the symbol could find no place. These hieroglyphics were in fact equivalent to the texts frequently inscribed upon the walls of our churches.

Further: there was no symbolism in public worship beyond

* Pictures were allowed in private houses, while they were still strictly forbidden in churches. Aversion to their public use ceased in the fourth century. On the other hand, it was still reckoned a heathen practice to represent objects of worship by images.—See Gieseler, "Ecclesiastical History," vol. ii., p. 38.

ART AND RELIGION.

that of the water and the bread, and there were no sacred places. "Where do you assemble?" was asked of Justin Martyr by the Prefect of Rome. "Where each man can and will," he replied. "You believe, doubtless, that we all meet together in one place, but it is not so; for the God of the Christians is not confined to one spot, but His invisible presence fills heaven and earth, and in all places He is worshipped by the faithful." The progress of change may be given in the words of Neander: "Gradually such arrangements were made in places of assembly as the proprieties of Christian worship required. An elevated seat was constructed for the reading of the Scriptures and the delivery of the sermon, and a table set for the distribution of the Supper, to which, so early as the time of Tertullian, —perhaps not without some mixture of the foreign Old Testament idea of sacrifice, at least not without furnishing a pretext for the speedy admission of this idea,—was given the name of altar." If it be true that in 302 A.D. a church at Edessa was separated into three parts in imitation of the Jewish temple, it affords another instance of the influence of Jewish ideas—the symbolism that was abolished—upon Christian thought. St. Paul saw, and denounced, that influence in his day.

But there came a time when Christianity took its place openly amidst the splendours of the pagan world; when an organized hierarchy, emerging from obscurity, began to play a part among the powers that be; when the finest public buildings became the halls of Christian assembly; and the clergy filled the seats of dignity heretofore occupied by imperial authorities, before the multitude of half-pagan worshippers. Then it was that Art was called upon to do what it had done for paganism, to embody the object of worship, to exalt and glorify it, to dignify ceremonial, to enfold the truth in sign and symbol, which the masses addressed could only understand by the imperfect or false light of pagan superstition. The small companies of believers meeting in bye-places had needed comfort and companionship, and delighted to think of the Lord in the humble form of a servant, worn and oppressed like themselves, and answering to the prophecy of Isaiah, "without comeliness." And if, according to the canons of Art then prevailing, they depicted the Saviour in the perpetual youth

ascribed to divinity, He was also ever employed in acts of beneficence and love—an individual love from which each believer drew solace to his heart. But when it was no longer the small companies of the faithful, but the masses of imperially instructed Christians, that had to be awed and governed, and when, too, the classic conditions of Art had yielded, if partly to Christian, partly also to barbarian influences, then the figure of the Lord,—no longer the loving Shepherd of the sheep,—became the bearded, stern-faced Ruler, robed, enthroned, colossal, and filling the far-off apse with His majesty; while prophets and apostles made the pomp of His court. Then, too, the nimbus which had adorned the figures of pagan divinities and imperial personages, was adopted into Christian art, and crowned the head or encircled the body of the divine King, and in due time in infinite variety designated the different ranks and orders of the heavenly potentates.

And then, as fear became more and more the instrument by which barbarian fierceness was to be subdued, or the sensual luxury of the dying empire reprov'd, the "*Rex tremendæ majestatis*" assumes a throne of flame; His hand grasps thunderbolts; a river of fire flows beneath His feet; the very angels tremble; and (strange anomaly) the ministers of Christ are demons, who do His pleasure in hurling the wicked into torment. Art here, as always, no doubt accurately reflects the religious sentiment of the day; no doubt—nay, we know—the glaring mosaic only echoed what the pulpit fulminated. The curses congealed upon the walls, and they remain to chill us still, while the sounds have sunk in silence. And the total change in the character of Christian Art illustrates the change from internal life to external relations, from the mutual edification of the saints to a means of influencing the world outside, which, however Christian in name, was far from Christian in character. Art becomes an engine in the hands of power and in the hands of craft, as we see it surrounding the Shepherd of souls with mundane regal state, making the wrath to come a present and a gross material fact, and gloating over every variety of bodily torment.

For if this exercise of Art was in the first instance the product of a change of circumstances, and a consequent subtle

change of feeling, we see it assisting and deepening that change. By turning rhetorical figures into facts of form and colour, impressions were produced that have proved almost indelible. Art became the creator of hell—of that hell which dwelt before the mediæval mind, and has descended to our own day. We cannot but ask: would the representations of the divine anger against unrighteousness, and as effecting the ultimate destruction of evil, in which fire, for its intensity, for its purifying and complete destructive power, is chosen as the aptest emblem,—would these representations have taken the definite, literal shape they have done, would the suffering of the soul have been so lost in the suffering of the body, if Art had not supplied the red tongues of flame, leaping to enwrap the writhing victim? The “oven of God’s anger” might have remained but the powerful metaphor of an ancient prophet, had not Art depicted its red-hot vault and bars of iron; and the literal renderings of the never-dying worm might never have found such currency if Art had not deliberately wrought out its loathly lineaments, and placed it a distinct and permanent object before the eyes of men.

A creation almost as terrible was that grotesque figure which for ages held possession of the European mind as the Evil One. The horns and cloven foot, the forked tail, and taloned wings, were an incarnation that dominated in all dark places, that made night hideous, that assaulted every feeble or sinful soul with terror indescribable; while it was the mockery of strong ones. This could hardly have been if Art had not elaborated that compound of all bestial monstrosities, so unworthy of the dim majesty of the Satan of Scripture.

And Art made the heaven also that myriads have died expecting; the floor of golden clouds, and the saints draped in crimson and blue in everlasting adoration. Art turned the visions of St. John into paint, and they became of the earth earthy. A materialistic heaven answered to the materialistic hell. But if pagan Art was incapable of the horrors of the one, so it could not have conceived a heaven of devout adoration and praise, which with all its monotonous poverty was far nobler than the pagan Elysium. Christian Art cannot be entirely credited with the angel, since the winged

genius of Etruscan and Classic Art plainly supplied the type; but it ennobled this idea by the bestowment of moral dignity and purity, and by exhibiting the angel as the direct minister of heaven, and an active agent in the unceasing conflict between good and evil. There was an ethical teaching in the unfailing victory of these pure-robed figures of feminine beauty over all the enginery of hell, by which Art atoned for its grossness in depicting the latter; and it may be believed that during ages that were dark in many ways, these bright forms shed a calm and helpful light, and gave to many a poor soul, beset by the devils that Art had raised, the assurance of near and effectual aid from heavenly powers. Those ludicrous fledglings, the bodiless cherubs, can only be attributed to inanity of Art, and the children toying among the clouds are too plainly Cupids, ill assorted with the saints. The curious fancy of representing the human soul as a naked child—far less poetical than the winged maiden, the Psyche of the ancients—was degrading to its true dignity; but that the Holy Ghost should ever have been so depicted, shows how profoundly Art can fail when she mistakes her function.

The most dangerous, because the most enchanting gift of Christian Art, has been the figure of the sacred Virgin—the holy Mother. Commencing in symbol, and apparently as a mode of expressing the orthodox faith respecting the person of the divine Son, this figure speedily became itself divine, restoring that female element in religious worship which had so large a place in paganism. It became so, apart from the manipulation of Art, but Art seized the gracious opportunity granted by dogma, and filled every fane with that fascinating presence. Yet she did not appear at first as an idealization of beauty. With the classic shrinking from realism that characterized early Art in dealing with the person of the Lord, the "Mother" was originally a conventional mystic figure, not at first associated with the Child. A purely theological purpose gave rise to that familiar association, and we may perhaps venture to trace much of that transference of homage from the Son to the Mother which took place in popular practice, to the fact of the mature dignity of the one being constantly in apposition with the infantine form of the other. The larger

and the protecting figure naturally absorbed the greater reverence. It was a combination that, if originally adopted as a theological expression, Art could never let go, finding in the tender theme unceasing inspiration, but losing in it eventually the majesty of the Mother, the divinity of the Child.

But from another cause, besides the luxury of Art, "the Mother" changed in character. Chivalry, passionately adoring beauty, raised woman to a pedestal of honour; and the Virgin Mother, to whom the ennobling thought was no doubt partly due, became under its influence "Our Lady"—the first of ladies—the Queen of Heaven. As such she shone in Art, and reigned in earth. Her crown, her sceptre, her robes, her beauty, entranced her votaries, and the bedizened figure of many a shrine of "Our Lady" supplied material shape to many an ecstatic vision. Surely this apotheosis of woman owed much to Art. What power would there be in the most fervent description comparable to that visible presentment of loveliness arrayed in gems and gold? How essential to the shrine of Our Lady was the Lady herself, smiling above the altar! Would Loyola have dreamed that dream without it?

We have spoken of the gradual predominance of the figure of the Mother over that of the Lord; a singular phase of this change is shown in the comparative disappearance of the throned Christ, as King or Judge of man, in favour of the human suffering victim. The crucifix, with its pallor and blood, was reared aloft, and the "stations" of the Passion were set up. It had been enough for the Roman or Greek Christian to depict the simple form of the cross, or to introduce the Lamb, as an understood symbol of the sacrificial death; but, partly the result of a change in theologic thought, partly of a grosser taste, partly perhaps owing to a sympathy with suffering generated by the woes of the time; more still, to the powerful convictions of sin, and demand for expiation, of which the Teutonic heart was capable; Art was now called to expatiate upon all the agonies of the most dreadful of deaths. The first attempts at the awful subject were hesitating and timid. A clothed Christ, or a living Christ, were placed in painless attitudes upon a cross that was more symbolical than actual in its shape. But Art felt the tragic thrill; the crowd—

the soul demanded sight and touch, and the agony and bloody sweat took dreadful life before the eager gazers. "Christ," said the apostle, "dieth no more." "He was once offered;" but now, by every artifice, the mind was thrown back upon the details of a terrible execution. It was dosed with horrors, and a God of vengeance—to some a very Moloch of blood—rose in the darkness of the background. Where were the gladness and singleness of heart of the early disciples? The element of joy was wellnigh banished from the Christian life. The torments of the cross, the torments of hell, in mediæval art surrounded that life with a frightful phantasmagoria, and reflect to us not only the ages of blood and misery in which they took their rise, but the self-torments of conscience unappeased. Well may it have been for humanity that at this time the image of the pitying Mother took the foremost place in every Christian Church. It is at least remarkable that the crucifix and the Madonna appeared together.

The martyrs—and, as time went on, the saints—of every realm brought more aliment to Art. The martyr, blood-bestedained, and handling proudly his instrument of martyrdom, stood forth as champion and hero of the faith. Wounds and death showed their immediate and visible fruit in victory and honour. The Church militant and the Church triumphant were as one. The saint—no mere happy memory of the street or fields, but the thaumaturgist devotee—was seen translated bodily into glory, in his habit as he lived, the patron of a numerous clientage below, and owning still the city or the village that gave him birth or claimed his care. Art became thoroughly sensational. But perhaps not even crucifixions, martyrdoms, and the occupations of demons, illustrate her wide departure from primitive and classic instincts so much as the fondness she acquired for depicting the physical ills of life and the ghastly secrets of the charnel-house. Those dances of death! those victims of vice! those sheeted and rotting corpses of frascoed corridors! Strange that a religion of life and immortality should produce an art that revelled in the foulnesses of the grave! So the stream of Art flowed on, rich and splendid, dark and turbid, with all the imaginings of men upon the grandest of themes.

A mediæval cathedral is the completest and grandest product of the successive ages of this Art-thought. It soars into the sky with all the dominance of a hierarchy that reaches in ascending dignity from earth to heaven. Angels, saints, and demons cluster over pinnacle and doorway without; within, each glorified window is ablaze with sacred mysteries and sacred figures. In mosaic, fresco, and sculpture, every wall and niche testifies to the perpetual presence of the supernatural, to perpetual miracle, to the present sufferings or rewards of the invisible world. The floor is heaped with tombs of the illustrious dead, where skulls and bones in chisel-work strangely mingle with the pomps of earth and heaven. The temple, vast in size, is laid along the ground in likeness of the great symbol of Christendom, and in proportion to its vastness is the number of subordinate temples enclosed within, opening right and left, the separate shrines of holy men and women of various rank and power; and pre-eminent among them the "Ladye Chapel" of the Queen of Heaven. An increase of sanctity marks every step towards the raised commanding spot at the far end, where sign and symbol culminate, where the glittering altar stands, where the gold-bespangled priests assemble, where the mystic ceremonial is dim in the smoke of incense. This is the heart of the great building. All sacred functions issue from and return to its secret penetralia. The pillared avenues lead up thither. Towards that spot every knee is bent and every prayer is uttered. The place is a true temple, a house for a god; for a temple was not intended so much for the worshippers as for the god and his ministers. Here, indeed, by the long extended nave, the worshippers are included; but the Christian hall of assembly is brought into singular union with the temple of Paganism.

Everything that lives will grow; but has the faith that we saw born amidst a society of believers assembling from house to house—has it grown to this? Or is it rather that the pure leaven cast into the huge lump of paganism has not yet leavened that lump; it is still "hidden" therein; and that what we see is the strange ferment of new ideas working in the midst of old ones? Is it a spectacle of force developed or of forces in conflict?

The magnificent Art creation we have glanced at is indeed inspired by something different from paganism. There is represented in it a consciousness of good and evil as immediately affecting individual human destiny; it touches virtues and vices to which the pagan mind was dull. Martyrs for the faith are an entirely new element; and the patience of the saints in works of love and mercy is new—for they were not merely fakirs and miracle-workers. The prayers and ecstasies of hermits, monks, and nuns; the purity of the Virgin Mother; above all, the Cross and its dying Victim, as a means of redemption for mankind,—these all belong to a new era. But on the other hand the whole is pervaded by an intense materialism. Every spiritual fact is encrusted over, and solidified, and brought into the closest likeness with the earthly, till all sense of its true majesty is lost. A splendid crowd of principalities and powers—divine, angelic, and spirits glorified—throng round and accompany humanity. The cloud of witnesses descends to earth, and faith is helped so mightily by sight, that it is faith no longer: men walk by sight. The horizon of spiritual things is contracted to the circle of vision, and the cope of heaven lowered to the very roof-tops. Invisible power, the sublime unity of which was the central thought of Judaism, is broken up and distributed among innumerable lesser individualities; while these, again, are associated with distinct localities of which they have become the protectors. Polytheism, in fact, returns much in the manner that it at first arose, but in a shape more anthropomorphic, since the powers revered are not those of nature, nor mythical heroes of a far-gone time, but men and women of a recent day, whose prosaic acts can be literally depicted.

Surely the “lump” prevails! The course has been backward instead of forward; and will it, we may ask, stop short of that last infirmity of noble minds—that rudest instinct of the supernatural—that lowest depth of superstition, the Fetish? Alas, no! We have already noticed the curious tendency in sculpture to generate this disease beyond other forms of representation. A coloured figure on a wall, or shown in the transparency of a window, does not awake the feeling. A *movable* picture is capable of rousing it to some extent; but the instant a sacred

figure arises in wood or marble, and stands—no mere surface shape to the spectator, but in solid roundness—a thing to be touched and handled, then the Fetish demon seizes it, inspires it, and cannot be expelled. The small pictures of the Virgin, or a favourite saint, that are the talisman of many a household; and the black bedizened dolls, the famous virgins of many a shrine, greasy from a thousand kisses; and the lip-worn toe of the ugly bronze in St. Peter's, illustrate different degrees of Fetish power, always depending upon tangibleness.

But there is a lower depth. We have seen the stupendous veneration which a Buddhist worshipper will lavish on an eyebrow or a tooth. Certain Christian missionaries have attributed this and other peculiarities to an imitation by the devil of so-called Christian institutions. Unfortunately, the devil had the priority in this matter, for Buddhist relic worship is older than Christianity. If the great enemy of mankind had anything to do with it, his subtlety was shown in the adaptation of relic worship to Christian ideas; so that shrines rivalling the magnificence of Buddhist temples, came to be erected by Christian hands over pieces of saints and martyrs, bits of the cross, or any possible or impossible shred of a holy thing.

And there is a yet profounder mystery of this evil. In the great Christian temple we have been describing, the whole building was seen subordinate to one spot of highest consecration—the altar. The altar! strange object in an edifice neither Pagan nor Jewish! yet not strange if Christianity in the midst of both, in conflict with both, was as yet as leaven in the lump. It may have been that by figurative reference to the old dispensation, similar to many such in apostolic language, the “*mensa sacra*” was first called an altar. It may have been that the inevitable altar of pagan ritual, and especially that with which every basilica, before it was Christian, was furnished for the swearing of witnesses, furthered the adoption; it may have been owing to changed conceptions of the rite it served;—but so it was that when that primitive company of men and women, with their ministering elders, edifying one another, exhorting one another, gathering together, round the table of the Lord, and abjuring priesthood and sacrifice excepting the Eternal Priest and the one sacrifice of

Himself,—after that company has disappeared with the departing radiance of the primitive age,—after the lapse of a few dim centuries,—there is again an altar, again a priest, again the mysteries and the sanctity of the inner fane! But if an altar, where the sacrifice? where the God? Both are there in that piece of wafered bread! It is the most sacred of all symbols, and in its homely simplicity might be supposed the least open to contaminating touch; but none the less, on that altar that was once a table, we discern with horror under the harmless wafer the demon leer of the Fetish! *

We regret the shock some devout minds may experience at such language, but strong words, plain words, are necessary to open to view this subtle device, than which surely none more subtle, or more fatal, has issued from the gates of hell against that Church with which they wage interminable war! The “body and blood of Christ,” not in symbol, but in fact? Then it is a relic such as the Buddhist fondles and enshrines in a costly pyx. The subject of a “Real Presence”? Then it is exactly what the basest of men have been ever prone to, in the rudimentary shape of a log or stone, or the more intellectual have been led to through the symbol and the idol; and always to their degradation and ruin. The disease has broken out again, and in the grossest materialistic form—and in the heart of the Christian Church! Having begun in the Spirit, the Church of the Spirit has sought to be made perfect by the flesh. If “that which goeth into a man doth not defile a man; but goeth out into the draught,” shall that which goeth

* Mr. Baring Gould, in the able work from which we have already quoted, aware of the exact application of his definition of Fetishism—a concentration of spirit or deity upon one point—to this sacramental doctrine, and admitting, too, that “every temple and shrine and priest” is a recognition of fetishism; endeavours thereupon to justify fetishism, and to give it philosophical dignity by the statement that “there is nothing necessarily superstitious in fetishism,” since it is merely the religious application of an observable general law—the law that forces act from centres, that power is gathered up at special points, and that objects may possess values not physically appreciable—with much other ingenious reasoning; to which it may be sufficient here to reply, that as he admits the manner in which the fetishist sometimes applies this law to be false and ludicrous, it remains to be proved whether it be not so to regard the sacramental wafer with fetishistic reverence. What observable force acts from this centre? What proof is there that power is gathered up at *that* point!

into him sanctify him? Yet the steps were all easy through which the mystery of Iniquity, already working in the days of the apostles—a leaven of hell, not of heaven, brought this strange thing to pass, and, travestying the words of the Lord, made the reception of Christ, the indwelling of Christ, the nourishment through Christ, to consist in an act of deglutition and digestion—the food for the soul as carnal as the food for the body! *

The progress of this marvellous transformation can, as we have intimated, be traced in Art from the wooden table on the raised dais, to the stone altar with its sculptured reredos, and all its mysteries—pulpit and lectern removed in its favour. And here, again, we say that while Art did but express a thought growing under many influences, she preached it with a more mighty eloquence than that of any golden-tongued doctor, as she constructed her fanes in every land, and reared her altars, and adorned them with the costly paten and chalice; carved and bejewelled with all her skill a tabernacle for the sacred thing, and vested with more than Levitical splendour the priests that handled it—It—the irrepressible Fetish that from the beginning the carnal soul has lusted after.

Yet that it has thus lusted is the very reason assigned by modern defenders of Romanism for the Idolatry and Fetishism which they contend “must have their expression in the Christian Church; as Catholic doctrine and practice, because *Catholic*, must “contain paganism entire, down to its most adulterated notions, Polytheism and Idolatry.” It is well to have these distinct admissions; and it is well, after submitting

* The writer recently listened to a sermon in a northern cathedral in which the preacher supported his assertion that salvation was impossible apart from participation in the sacrament to those who had the opportunity (the fate of others being unrevealed) by the argument that as sin and death entered into the world by the act of eating—to wit, an apple,—so restoration of spiritual life was made solely dependent upon another act of eating—to wit, the bread of the sacrament; and that inasmuch as daily sin weakened the power of this food, so it was necessary to partake of it daily, or as often as possible. A Protestant Bishop sat in his lawn beside the preacher, but did not start from his seat to rebuke the grossness, and the large congregation departed with church-going contentment in their faces. If indeed the acids of the apple, and not the disobedience of the man, constituted the injurious element in the transaction, the parallel might hold.

ART AND RELIGION.

awhile to the subtle reasonings of these modern advocates for Fetishism, Polytheism, and Idolatry, to turn to that Record which, although in the language of one of them only "so much paper,—mashed cotton rags,—so much ink,—treacle and lamp-black,"* yet preserves to us the words of Christ and the teachings of His Apostles. How those words which "are spirit and are life" smite the Idol and search out the hiding-places of the Fetish! In them, thank God, we find no such doctrine of Catholic "inclusion" and "universal affirmation." We do find a very Protestant denial and negation, not only of the dumb Idols of the Gentiles, the vanities from which they are to turn to the Living God; but also of the carnal ordinances of the old economy,—those things which were but "figures of the true," and which were only "imposed until the time of reformation." No doubt Christianity includes and satisfies every desire of humanity after God, but it does so, not by restoring and including all the clumsy devices of ignorance, but by showing their true spiritual equivalents. Christianity removes the crutches of bodily service, and bestows the wings of faith and love.

Fallen again under bondage to "the weak and beggarly elements," Religion became a mechanical operation dependent upon the finger and thumb. If the kingdom of heaven was become meat and drink, salvation could be procured for a man, and not by him—he might buy that meat, he could purchase that gift of the Holy Ghost. But this was Religion no longer, as it was Christianity no longer; and Art, which had done so much to build up the vast and magnificent fabric, and which in all its perversions had often breathed an ardent faith,—Art, though now furnished with higher gifts than it had possessed since the wreck of the classic world, began to suffer from the fatal paralysis and inanity which had fallen upon Religion.

Art had been inspired by faith; and in looking back upon its course, it is impossible not to render homage to its reverent and earnest efforts, even while it helped to render the objects of faith more and more objects of sense. In architecture especially, Art had risen to a grandeur and solemnity of expression which it had not reached even in the solemn land

* Baring Gould.

of Egypt. Gothic Art was full of tenderness and sympathy; and though it could deal with size as an element of grandeur, laid more stress upon infinite and loving elaboration of parts, and the imitation of Nature's free, graceful, and delicate handiwork. It was full of the mystery of intricacy—the mystery of “glimmering bowers and glades.” It lifted its roof far above the heads of the worshippers, as if to give room for the ascending breath of prayer. It towered to the clouds in pinnacle and spire, as if emulating those mountain summits which seem to dwell in heaven. And in the subordinate arts of painting and sculpture, the patient striving after an adequate expression of the Christian conceptions of purity, sorrow, suffering, and of triumph through these; the vivid presentation of the powers of the upper and the under world, as moral beings; the profusion and ingenuity of symbol and device;—in all this, Art, working according to her light, and intensely believing in that light, demands our admiration and reverence.

But as Religion declined into the mere fetishism of the building, the picture, the image, the sacrament, and became sensuous, as these are sensuous, Art declined also. We see the same process repeated that occurred in Greek Art. Religion, sapped by Art, left Art for a time supreme. Only nominally religious, and attracting all regards to herself, she shone forth with a brief but unparalleled splendour, the result of a singular conjunction of circumstances. At the moment when the purity and spirituality of Christian thought were, as the denunciations of Savonarola attest, nearly extinct, the treasures of ancient art were opened up, and fired by the facile vigour and perfection of form displayed, painters and sculptors revelled in the resurrection of gods and goddesses. The anomalous blending of pagan art with Christian ideas, excusable in the imperfect art-power of early Christians, was carried to outrageous lengths by artists and applauding patrons, churchmen though they might be, who cared only for the æsthetic properties of art. The most sacred personages were elaborately postured for the display of limbs and drapery. The divine Mother and her Son suggested lovely compositions of rich robing and delicate flesh. Artists painted their own mistresses as virgin saints, and the end was near. Even the Infinite and Unapproachable

One—the Eternal Father Himself—became a familiar subject as the bearded Jupiter of old, and with that tremendous profanation, though dared by the genius of a Michael Angelo, a Raphael, and a Titian, pictorial and sculptural art began to wither—dwindling into gaud, and glitter, and vapid conceit.*

We cannot name Michael Angelo, however, without referring to his perfectly independent position in Religious Art—the independence of profound originality. His art was unecceistical, but it was religious. It was pagan, but not sensuous. It was personal, melancholic, spiritual; and in this sense he deserves the appellation some have given him of the great Protestant of Art. Perhaps we may in some sort indicate the peculiarity of his genius by saying that instead of illustrating the process we have been describing—Christianity corrupted by paganism—he shows paganism inspired by Christianity: that is to say, pagan forms of physical strength and beauty, possessed and energized by the Christian ideas of suffering and sorrow, and by the powers of the world to come. But he could not save either Art or Religion.

The degradation of Art had been prepared by the bonds which, as in Egypt, a priestly order had imposed. Bereft of individual character, it was subjected to stringent rules, and a direful monotony of subject, as in the endless repetitions of Holy Families, annunciations, crucifixions, saintly personages, martyrdoms, and the like. Puerility of subject was a constant necessity, and ingenuity was more and more taxed to illustrate dogmas and glorify creeds. But the most deadly revenge that Religion, though unconsciously, took upon Art, was in lavishing upon her superstitious regard. The Fetish slime soon destroys Art. The true artist cannot work for the base homage of the incense-pot. He knows that the coarsest stuff serves for this sort of adoration, and will not submit to have a choice picture bored with holes that a mock crown may be inserted upon a saintly head, or to provide sculpture for adornment by a neck-

* Didron has shown with what horror the early Church regarded any attempt to represent God the Father in the likeness of Jupiter. Nor was He portrayed at all in Art, other than symbolically, or in the guise of the Son, till the close of the thirteenth century. It was reserved, however, for the sixteenth century to make of the Eternal Father simply an opportunity for depicting venerable age.

lace of sham jewels. The job artist will do for this, and those who can enjoy such decorations have lost capacity for both Art and Religion. Architecture suffered with the other arts; where Gothic styles were still practised, they lost simplicity and beauty; but Rome found in Old Rome that which suited her better, and developed the bold, bad bigness of St. Peter's, a most appropriate temple for a religion that was imitating all the vices of paganism, and falling into the same decay. It has been usual to date the corruption of Religious Art from the promulgation of the Tridentine doctrines, yet these were but the legitimate outcome of all that had gone before. Christianity and Art, paganized alike, had corrupted each other during their long association. A worldly, sensual Art was the fit expression of a Religion worldly and sensuous in proportion as it was materialized and superstitious.

But the unseen leaven was not destroyed, and its spiritual force, preserved in many devout hearts, suddenly asserted itself. We have reached that crisis when the great deeps were broken up—that of the waters surrendering its hidden world; that of ancient art its treasures; that of thought unveiling its speculations; that of the soul setting free its spiritual and individual nature. There resulted from the whole of these changes, occurring simultaneously, that which in Religion has borne the significant title of the Reformation.

This movement, now so frequently disparaged, was for one thing an assertion of the rights of the individual soul in its intercourse with God. It claimed for each and all a free and direct approach to the Father of Spirits, irrespective of priests and altars, of time and place. It rested the means of salvation, not in sacraments, but in truth; not in acts of the body, but of the mind; and before this intense individualism, and sense of spiritual reality, all the *machinery* of Religion, and the elaborate Art that had subserved it, went to pieces. Everywhere what are called desecrations took place, for the voice of the awakened heart was heard crying out against the idols that had crowded out Christ, and hidden the face of the Father.* No wonder that the beauty of fane and altar, of

* The practical preference given to the Madonna or the Saints in the

image and picture, ceased to enchant; or their inherent, if perverted piety to affect those who felt them to be no longer helps, but hindrances. This immense change was no doubt chequered by inconsistency and excess. It could not be otherwise. The Lutheran communities still held to a mysticism concerning the Sacrament, which was not surprising in an age that still believed in witchcraft and demon apparitions. Luther's indignant logic carried him a deal too far in disputing the efficacy of the works of the Law. Excesses of individualism led to self-announced prophets, democratic kingdoms of the saints, and much else. But the great blow was struck for spiritualism against materialism, and the effects of that Thor's hammer-stroke are with us still in a daylight above, and a breathing space around, that we may trust will never be battened in again.

A development of Religious Art at this period favoured (as it illustrates) its individualism. The invention of wood-block and copper-plate printing, and the application of this new power to the multiplication of Scripture designs, such as the *Historia Hebræorum*, and the *Greater and Lesser Passions* of Albert Dürer, put into the hands of every man, religious representations he could only meet with before in the church or religious house. Thus every one could have his private gallery of sacred pictures, and could furnish his own sanctuary; while, again, these religious designs became historical rather than symbolic, concerned as the most popular of them were with the illustration of Scripture narratives. The progress in this respect is shown in Dürer's own life: he began with devoting his art to the Blessed Virgin, and was frequently mystical enough, but became continually more biblical in his subjects. The *Passions*, bearing also the titles of the *Humiliation and Exaltation of the Lord*, or the *History of the Fall and Redemption*, are vividly historic, and his last occupation was with figures of the apostles, among the grandest ever painted. Holbein, however, carried realistic illustration still further, and dedication of churches and altars in Roman Catholic countries justifies the first statement, notwithstanding all the crucifixes and stations of the Passion. And in the same countries the disappearance of the divine Fatherhood, and the representations of the Almighty as simply a Being of irresistible power and almost implacable vengeance justifies the second.

his Scripture designs, published under the title of "*Icones Veteris Testamenti*," which became immensely popular, are among the best as they were amongst the earliest of pictured Bibles. His sarcastic prints, "*The Indulgence Shop*," and "*Christ the true Light*," were powerful sermons in art to which the graving tool gave tongue. But the great fact to be noted was the immense dispersion of religious designs by means of printing, so robbing church walls of their monopoly. Giotto's Gospel frescoes in the chapel at Padua were for the few who could enter within its doors; illuminations were for the rich possessors of manuscripts: Albert Dürer's and Holbein's designs were for the thousand in their homes.

Art in its decline under the trammels of ecclesiasticism, and the vapid nature of that Christian Olympus it had created; sapped, too, in its energy by the scepticism which was assailing a materialistic religion, found a new field in Nature. It was now that portraiture came into vogue, animal painting, still-life, and especially landscape painting. For the first time we notice a recognition of the infinite pathos and ministry to human thought of natural scenery. Titian, one of the last of the great Christian pagan painters, was the earliest of the painters of landscape; the first, that is, who habitually felt and expressed the sublimity of mountains, clouds, and atmospheric effects. It was a revelation to Art belonging to a time when men were navigating all seas, traversing all lands, and finding themselves far from friendly help, cast upon the bosom of Nature, which is the bosom of God. It was a time when in the voices of winds, and seas, and forests, and in the colours and shapes hung round the great world temple, were discovered influences more powerful, sympathies more deep, than any temple reared by human hands, with all its saints and glories, angels and devils, could supply. Landscape Art has ever since been occupying more and more space upon our walls, while, notwithstanding some late reaction, conventional Religious Art, even in sacred edifices, has been declining.*

The Reformation was the great rebellion of Christendom

* In "*Cadore or Titian's Country*," the writer has endeavoured to show at length the relation of Titian and Landscape Art to the great movements of the time.

against the materialism with which paganism had infected Christianity. Buddhism had been a revolt of the same kind against the gross materialism of the Brahmanical religion; and there was another revolt, of which we should speak before proceeding further, that which was raised by Mohammed against the idolatry prevailing both outside and inside the Christian fold. It is an emphatic instance of the Prophet, whose power is in words alone, not in ceremonial or art-symbol, destroying what the priest has set up. In this case the leader of the revolt, bearing always the title of "the Prophet," had a true prophet's message. He spoke burning words, recalling men to the worship of the one Almighty. "There is no god but God," was the cry that rang through East and West; prayer was declared to be the only means of approaching Him; individual prayer, everywhere and anywhere,—the desert or the housetop, it mattered not. So unlocalized was it that at first no special place for prayer, still less any building adorned by architectural art, seems to have been contemplated.

In strict accordance with this spiritual conception, images and paintings were rigidly prohibited, and recognizing their fetishistic tendency, no representations of living beings were permitted to the faithful, even in their houses. "Angels," said Mohammed, "would not enter a dwelling in which were such pictures;" and with a grim humour he denounced upon their possessors the penalty in the next world of finding souls for them. Out of these principles grew the mosque, a place for prayer and preaching only. A marked characteristic of the building is its square plan. As there are neither priests nor altars, the old pagan form of temple, with the adytum shut off from the people, or the Christian adaptation of it in nave and choir and apse, are not required for the company of equal believers gathered on the floor, each prostrate on his separate carpet, or listening to the exhortation from the pulpit. The square plan best expresses the character of the worship; and from this fundamental form springs the chief architectural feature of the whole building, the dome, one of the noblest of art conceptions, as it is one of the greatest triumphs of construction. The dome is as another sky spreading equally over

all worshippers, and expressing alike the Unity of the object worshipped, and the unity of those who worship. Wherever throughout the East the dome rules, majestic in simplicity, as in loftiness and space, there, with whatever of superstitious accretion or formality, the worship of the one God prevails. Again, attached to the mosque there is the minaret, a tower of strictly practical purpose, from which, with a beautiful fitness, none but the human voice shall call the faithful to their devotions. In these points the mosque, as a place of spiritual and individual worship, shows itself far superior to the so-called Christian temples of Europe.

Yet Mohammed yielded to one singular piece of fetishism, the result, probably, of an early and ineradicable superstition respecting the remarkable black stone—perhaps an areolite—preserved at Mecca. Towards the spot rendered sacred by this strange stone, an absolute Fetish, all prayer was to be directed; and the one object in a mosque that savours of localized sanctity is the niche that marks the direction of Mecca, and towards which every kneeling figure turns. And as in Buddhism reverence for the teacher or the saint led to relic worship, so in Mohammedanism this reverence, added to a vivid belief in the presence of departed spirits in or about their sepulchres, led to a peculiar respect for the tomb. A very ghastly doctrine affected to some extent the shape of this last habitation. After the corpse has been laid therein, two black angels present themselves; the defunct is commanded to sit up, and he is interrogated upon the articles of his faith, and the character of his deeds. If satisfactory, the soul, which has been temporarily reunited to the body, is drawn gently from the lips, and the body is left to repose. If the contrary, the wretched creature is assailed with iron clubs, and the soul is driven forth with tortures. To facilitate this appalling transaction, the body, uncoffined, is deposited in a roomy vault; and this interior form, together with the use of the dome in mosques, contributed probably to the domical construction of all the greater Moslem tombs. In India the fancy of the Tartar sovereigns to build their tombs in their lifetime, and to occupy them first as festal halls, before they entered them, silent for ever but for the perpetual whisper of prayers, led to an un-

equalled magnificence of tomb building. That of one of the Deccan princes, in a now deserted city, displays the boldest, grandest dome in the world.

So this faith projected itself in Art; an art entirely architectural, beautiful, and noble, and which even in ornamentation developed a new style, since, forbidden to introduce animal or human forms, it devised those exquisite complexities of curve and angle, and leaf and flower, and Arabic letter, which, under the name of arabesque, have supplied themes for the skill of the highest art. More free originally from idolatrous or fetishistic taint than any other faith, it is not necessary for us to dwell upon the corruptions and superstitions that have encumbered its decay; except to point out that Art, by investing places of prayer and the tombs of the dead with an outward consecration, and thus adding to the attractions of pilgrimage, had its part in fostering them.

We must, however, come nearer home and to later times. England, in its religious buildings, offers a singular spectacle, and one curiously illustrating the forces of its religious life.

It is a land of cathedrals. Their grey towers rise over the landscape in all the quiet centres of episcopal rule. The tombs and effigies of kings and barons, bishops and abbots, a mailed and mitred aristocracy, adorn their solemn aisles. Each is an historical museum, stored not by the luck or caprice of the collector, or by the method of science, but by the natural selection of ages. In these edifices—in the varieties of architectural style which distinguish them, in the changes and additions that each has undergone, and in their heterogeneous contents,—the nation's history has been written—its dynasties, tempers, and tastes. From every town and village, too, there rise towers and spires of beauty, within and around which are gathered innumerable memorials of national and local life. "The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power, and all that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave" to render each neighbourhood illustrious, will be found in the church; while round the humblest ivy-mantled tower the "rude forefathers of the hamlet sleep," and the porchway is worn with the feet of generations. Furthermore, these edifices, one and all, have been for ages centres of

ART AND RELIGION.

religious life, and are consecrated by the piety of innumerable worshippers, who have sought within their walls "forgiveness of sins, the communion of saints, and the life everlasting."

Buildings such as these are closely linked with the natural piety and the home delight of every Englishman's heart. They are proud and at the same time tender memorials of the past. Yes, they belong indeed to the past! Not more clearly does every grey lichened stone and worm-graven beam declare it, than does every line of the plan and detail of construction speak of that past which built itself up a huge medley of Pagan and Christian ideas. These are places for ceremony, symbol, mystery, and miracle; for "posture and imposture;" for vestment and incense; for thrones, and for them that sit thereon. They were intended for saints and their shrines; for the Queen of Heaven and her worship; for the altar and its functions; for the holy wafer;—in a word, for the Priest, and not for the Church.*

But to England there came the breath of the Reformation as a rushing mighty wind, and tower and steeple rocked for awhile beneath it. Altar, and image, and picture were swept out in its fury. But the effect was only partial and transient. How could its intense individualism find a home in these sanctuaries, constructed for an obedient and kneeling multitude, while "religion" was performed at the other end? How could justification by faith alone—the personal act of the soul—live, where everything pointed to a daily sacrifice offered for the people? How could the universal priesthood adjust itself to a place in everything arranged for the functions of a priestly order? How could the brotherhood of Christ's disciples be shown forth where the very building itself separated them into churchmen and lay people? No; every principle and detail of the architecture, every line of the art it encountered, was hostile to this gust of the Spirit blowing where it listed—was a protest against this religion of the individual heart, drawn from the Holy Book and propagated by the living voice.

That voice might sound along the aisles with its Gospel message; that book might be chained to the desk in view of all; and the wooden table of communion might supersede the altar;

* "Where there is a Priest, there cannot be a Church."—DR. ARNOLD.

but the *genius loci*, allied as it was with that of regal power, was too strong to be dispossessed. The throne of the bishop, which had been the rival, became the representative of the kingly throne, and the national edifices were gradually re-occupied by the powers spiritual and temporal, side by side. Soon the priest was seen gliding from the vestry door; soon the table took the semblance of an altar; soon the kneeling people gathered as before around rite and symbol. "Mother Church"—a grand impersonation of priests and bishops, doctors and saints, not of the living present, but of the dead past—again reigned supreme in the chancel, while sovereign secular authority hung up its effigy opposite. Plainly the Reformation could not thrive in the English Church. The unnatural combination brought discord, and then deadness and formality. The Laudian doctrines drove out the Puritanical, to be succeeded in turn by those of Arminius; and when the second, in the guise of Evangelicalism, returned after long banishment, they were received as a foreign element out of harmony with its traditions and economy. At last the sacerdotal spirit, issuing in these days from its stronghold behind the altar railings, has boldly repudiated the Reformation altogether, reclaimed the building, and is occupying it with the ancient services.

There was much in the compromise that lasted so long agreeable to the temperament of a nation so composite as our own, so disposed to moderation, so conservative of time-honoured institutions, so aristocratic in its leanings. But was the Reformation to find no home for itself in England? Far otherwise. Let us look again at the English landscape, and we shall note alongside every tower and steeple, and even in greater number, certain ugly, wide-spanned roofs, and walls pierced with windows which are a travesty either of classic or of Gothic forms; or buildings which, if of later date, and greater pretensions than these, are yet unmistakably different from the national edifices. These tasteless erections, deformities for the most part in every lane and street, are a unique feature in the aspect of England. No other country shows the like; and these are what the Reformation built for itself.

It was impossible for that great awakening not to stir

the English heart more deeply than the National Church could find room for. It was impossible but that a race so self-reliant, and accustomed to individual and municipal liberty, should not welcome more abundantly than any other that doctrine which raised the individual man into direct communion with God; which, putting aside priestly mediation, brought him within the veil by the new and living way. The fresh religious life was certainly difficult to control. At all accesses of energy it developed new forms, after the law of everything that has life; and sometimes threw off singular and anomalous products. But it was life; it was a personal and intense conviction. It did great things, and amongst others built everywhere its "meeting-houses."

This old familiar designation best describes the unlovely edifices; and is to be honoured rather than scorned. The meeting-house is the meeting-place of Christians with one another, and with God. For so great a purpose a roof to shelter the worshippers, a pulpit for exhortation and instruction, a table for the Christian feast, were all that was necessary. Every detail of Church organization and Church worship connected with these buildings illustrated the ruling principle of individual responsibility. As in the one system the primary unit was the priest, so in the other it was the man or woman who had acknowledged Christ, and a certain number of whom formed the "Church." Its ministers, of its own appointment, were chosen as men fitted to lead its assemblies, and were separated to the study of the Word, not consecrated to the administration of sacraments. In public worship, prayer was made the direct utterance of the minister—that is to say, the utterance of one swayed by all the influences of the hour, and by his own personal participation in the universal need. The daily sacrifice was the daily lifting up of holy hands in heartfelt supplication. If there was mediation other than that of the One Mediator, it was not by means of any function of the priest, but through the wrestling of a human soul in audible appeal to the Father of spirits. The sacraments conveyed no magical or mysterious virtue in themselves, but availed only in proportion as the mind and heart of those concerned were affected by them. The Church did not exist for the

sake of the sacraments, but the sacraments for the Church; the man—the soul of the man—was everywhere put before the thing, however sacred.

The intense realism and spiritual thoroughness of all this is appalling to contemplate—as the demands of the Sermon on the Mount are appalling,—and no doubt the strain is often too severe for the ability of both minister and people. There is a grievous falling off in practice. But the aim is noble. It is in true harmony with the new soul-life born under the Reformation; nay, with that earlier birth among the company of disciples upon whom, apostles and people alike, came the consecrating tongues of flame. The Nonconformists of England venture, indeed, to claim nothing less than this high parentage for their Churches. It is the sole warranty for their existence; and surely this alone can explain their existence in face of the influences opposed to them. Constantly losing those to whom the requirements of this individualism are too onerous, too spiritual, or whose culture is offended by excesses or deficiencies to which such ministrations are liable; or those who are attracted by the orderly decorum of forms which admit of no change, and commit no one; or by the æsthetic charm or time-consecrated usages of the national Church;—constantly also under the pressure of social disadvantages more or less galling,—it would seem that only the possession of a great spiritual truth can account for their perennial vigour. There must be something commending itself to the English heart and conscience, something belonging to the very genius of Christianity, something born of the Spirit, or this thing, English Nonconformity, could not live.

That it does live, all these meeting-houses—these Zions, Bethels, and the like, these new pretentious erections at every corner—afford outward and visible proof. Plainly, at the outset there was a negation of Art. It has been so with every deep spiritual movement. It was so with Buddhism and Mohammedanism, which were spiritual in measure, although not Christian. It was so emphatically with Christianity, the spiritual religion, and with the Protestantism and Puritanism to which it successively gave birth. And even now there are those who will be apt to say that a profounder sense of

ART AND RELIGION.

spiritual things can be experienced, and a truer worship offered, where a few poor Christian people assemble in a cottage, a barn, or on a hillside, than amidst the most impressive adjuncts art can bestow. Mean surroundings bring into strong relief the majesty and the condescension of the Great King whose presence is invoked, as well as the essential dignity of each human soul that seeks Him; while the open field seems to bring the God of nature nearer. No art can be adequate to the occasion. The most elaborate symbol fails to reach it, if it does not degrade, and in this point of view all Art seems out of place.

Yet, since according to our opening definition, Art is a language, why may it not have a part along with oral and written language in the service of Religion? Doubtless it may find a part; but as oral and written language have only a limited sphere, the sphere of Art may be still more limited. That which is written or spoken may convey absolutely new facts to the mind, or it may address the reason in argument; yet the fact and the argument have both but a limited part in dealing with the soul. Again, the language of words may rouse attention, and draw forth emotion, while still Religion is not advanced, since it means something more than awakened attention or stirred feelings. Religion is something different even from worship, which, like other acts, is only of value as it expresses and strengthens an inward condition. The distinction so often urged between faith and works applies equally, though it is not so often enforced, to religion and worship; for the latter is but an act, whether of mind or body, although from its immediate concern with spiritual matters, it appears more directly religious than others. Yet it may be less so; for Religion requires the bent and purpose of a life, the result of a change, slow or sudden, obvious or secret, which it denominates a new birth. Worship and good works are but functions of this new life. The preacher or the book may set this process going, may sustain, revive, direct it; but there must be a seed or a root, a sap or a power, independent of such aids, to bring forth the fruit of eternal life. From this life there springs a worship which is in spirit and in truth; to which,

ART AND RELIGION.

indeed, words may prompt, and to which words and song may minister, as they offer means of utterance.

In all this, what is the function of Art? It conveys no facts unknown before. It does not appeal to the reason. It does not probe the conscience. Its power of awakening attention is limited, for it makes no sudden appeals, it effects no surprises. It is a constant element. Once in its place, it is day by day repeating the same story, and weakening it by the reiteration. For the same reason, its power of drawing forth emotion is soon expended. Art can, as we think, only put the beholder for awhile into sympathy with its thought, and dispose him for that which he must work out for himself. All Art is like that branch of it, music, of which Bacon said that "it helpeth the mood it findeth." It has small originaive power, and that which it has is suspicious. For if worship be often mistaken for Religion, the effects of Art are often mistaken for worship. The sense of beauty or of awe it sometimes inspires, is mistaken for religious sentiment; yet how much has it to do with the contrition of the penitent, the adoration of the reverent, the thankfulness of the grateful heart? Or when such emotions have real possession of the soul, how much cognizance is there of surrounding Art?

And Art brings with it positive dangers. It has a constant tendency to attract attention to its own perfections or demerits. It inevitably asks for criticism, and this is fatal to any moral result. The higher the culture and susceptibility appealed to, the more will the Art, and not the end, be regarded. A critical audience is seldom moved by the orator, except to admiration of his skill; he must conceal it behind a rare earnestness to succeed. A connoisseur cannot help giving his chief attention to the artistic merits of the building, the picture, the sculpture; and the art orator cannot so well conceal his art behind moral intention. Upon the ignorant or uncultured, inferior art is more likely to be effective; but it is also more likely to degrade its subject. Nor must it be forgotten that Art exercises a sensuous influence upon the physical side of our nature. Sweet sounds captivate the ear, and sweet forms and colours charm the eye; and when sense is pampered, the spirit sickens. Add to all this that Art, as we have endeavoured to show, has a peculiar

ART AND RELIGION.

tendency to harden, to materialize, and so to deprave religious ideas,—if not in the end to breed the mental disease of Fetishism,—and it may be admitted that Art is weaker for good, and stronger for evil, in matters of Religion than other modes of utterance.

Still, it must not be forgotten that Art expression is an essential requirement of human nature,—an utterance that cannot be denied; that civilization develops, refines, and multiplies the means of this utterance to an infinite degree, and demands its use. “The singular diligence of the artificer” becomes ever more active and ingenious, and more in request. Shall, then, the great thoughts of Religion find no expression in Art? And if buildings are still necessary for the services of a worship even so spiritual as the Christian, shall the cunning hand and imaginative brain of Art have no part in their construction and adornment?

Taking the latter point first, we may suggest a few general principles which cannot but apply, however strictly pagan ideas and the dangerous tendencies of Art are guarded against. We may say indeed that one great law, carried out in all its applications, will cover the whole ground of the ministration of Art to religious worship. This is *FITNESS*—adaptation to use. To depart from fitness to the end in view in any work of man, is to depart from a first law of divine working in nature, and to introduce an element of falsity, destructive in itself, and especially repulsive in any work dedicated to religious ends. Fitness applies both to the demands of direct utility and to the congruity of the ideas suggested with the final purpose of the whole. As regards simple utility, the first demand of Fitness is adaptation in size and form to the uses of an assembly which it is assumed meets only for common prayer, common praise, listening to an exhortation common to all; the baptism and the supper. Size is easily determined in this view, by sufficiency of space for the number of the assembly, and yet a space not inconsistent with the purposes for which it meets, namely, conscious association, and the seeing and hearing a speaker. These conditions exclude the vast dimensions required by the impossible attempt to construct what shall be worthy of a divine habitation; or those appro-

ART AND RELIGION.

pritate to elaborate theatrical ceremonial, the array and the procession of a multitude of priestly officials. But, on the other hand, they require dimensions which give importance to the building, and a size demanding stability of construction. This stability should be obvious rather than concealed in every case, but especially where the concentration and elevation of thought so necessary in each worshipper, must necessarily be disturbed by any suggestion of insecurity.

Form is the next consideration to which Fitness applies. To this, size and stability have something to say; not less the conditions already mentioned, of seeing and hearing; and still more a congruity with the main ideas of Christian worship. Of these, the equality of the assembly before Him who is worshipped, and the absence of any special sanctity in person, place, or thing, in His eyes who ordained the destruction of the once Holy Place, must be governing principles. To this last the greatest importance belongs, since the opposite idea has obtained such currency in the Christian system, and has worked so much mischief, while it is no doubt of immense advantage to Art by offering a point of concentration for the whole construction, and for culmination of effect. Art, however, must not rule, but truth; and Christian truth demands the abolition of the adytum. A cruciform plan, although commending itself both from its symbolic reference, and the scope afforded to Art, yet so lends itself to the special sacredness of a part, that it becomes objectionable. The parallelogram of the basilica is one of the simplest, as it is one of the most beautiful of forms; but the interior columns, to which so much of the beauty of the basilica is due, are unsuited for the purposes of a Christian assembly; and in the apse there lurks a danger, when it is reserved for the holy table and its ministers. The square plan of the mosque, or an adaptation of it, is free from such dangers and inconsistencies. Oriental genius has shown how this may be associated with artistic beauty and impressiveness; so have also the great Italian architects in their baptistries; and those who have seen a crowded congregation in such an one as that of S. Giovanni at Florence, will remember how admirably its octagonal form is disposed for congregational purposes.

ART AND RELIGION.

Size and form of plan dictate to some extent the character of the exterior, which must needs rise with some loftiness, and may fairly challenge a place among buildings of whatever secular importance. Here the Fitness of utility requires adaptation to climate and material; while the Fitness of congruity suggests a style of design suitable to national characteristics, to historical associations, to the type of civilization, but above all in harmony with the purpose of the building. And there can be no higher purpose. However strongly we may repudiate the notion of sacred places, it cannot be forgotten that such a building is not for man only, but also for God. It is for worship—the common worship of a multitude, invoking the Divine presence. If there are means, opportunity, and desire for anything beyond the bare but sufficient accommodation of the people; if the resources of Art are called upon to render some expression of their common feeling; this must be the ruling thought in the design, not for the purpose of making a house worthy of the Most High, not in shape of a meritorious offering to Him, but as an expression of appropriate reverence and appreciation of the purpose. Dignity, then, may be reckoned a chief element of the design, if there is to be the fitness of congruity. And for dignity, unity and simplicity of form are essential. This is perhaps less understood than any other principle of architecture by those who have felt constrained to depart from ecclesiastical traditions. They have been too much addicted to running up a façade, very pretentious in itself, perhaps, but hiding the utmost meanness of design and construction. When used for such a purpose, nothing can be in worse taste; while it has led to the neglect of that which really constitutes a building—the roof, without which the four walls are meaningless. Mr. Ruskin has dwelt forcibly upon the symbolic expressiveness of this feature in a building, and shown how nobly it may be developed. And for a building, which in a Christian, not in a Pagan sense, may still be called the House of God, this element of nobleness—a roof, in size and style lifted above other roofs,—is particularly to be desired. The roof, as all know, is the glory of mediæval architecture; while the classic, and our own poor imitations of the classic, make nothing of it. We are not, however, con-

fined to mediæval types of roof, and we may again call attention to the oriental development of the dome as displaying a kind of roof majestic, simple, beautiful, and especially in harmony with that form of worship which calls forth the prayer and song of a multitude. It is, however, only the larger buildings to which it would be appropriate.

With Dignity we must associate Beauty. Yes, surely, for beauty is a predominating, though not an invariable principle of the works of God ; and no work of man should be devoid of a beauty according with its purpose. Now a place of worship is for the use of that part of our nature which is the most glorious—the spiritual part ; and it is intended to foster all those virtues of mind and character for which beauty is the aptest, as it is the divinely appointed symbol—those “things which are lovely.” But beauty may easily be so understood as to destroy dignity. It is often confounded with ornament. Beauty may be expressed in proportion, and the simplest lines. Beauty will break up the heavy massiveness of parts, which, as in St. Peter’s, are the very vulgarity of size ; and by elaboration of detail bestow dignity where the element of size is wanting. Beauty, moreover, will imitate the delicacy and tenderness of Nature’s own fingers in her handiwork ; will be sparing, will be chaste, in any approach to ornament ; and will ever remember that the pathos which Nature spreads over everything beautiful is no less appropriate to a building which is to be the home alike of hopes and fears ; of penitence, sympathy, and sorrow ; of thoughts of an unknown future beyond the gate of death ; of remembrance of the departed ; of a religion which, though it tells us to “rejoice always,” yet warns us to rejoice with trembling ; and to remember that here we have no continuing city. The prevalence of a pathetic sentiment will exclude garish colours and flamboyant ornamentation, subduing everything to a tender grace, which will be the surest safeguard both of dignity and beauty.

To these qualities we would fain add something of Mystery, since religion deals with an invisible God, an invisible state, and with aspirations after that which is not yet revealed. But mystery can scarcely be suggested otherwise than by darkness, and darkness genders superstition. Darkness quells, abases

the spirit to the dust of death, instead of raising it to the life everlasting. In the old dispensation, the Lord dwelt in the **thick darkness**, a powerful emblem, and appropriate to the darker **economy** and the grosser natures it served. But the Christian dispensation proclaims that God is light, and that in Him is no darkness at all. **To us the Sun of Righteousness** has risen, and we are to be "light in the Lord." These are reasons for eschewing that great source of mystery the "dim religious light" of which mediævalism, following the example of paganism, made so much,—for banishing the darkness which was sought even in the temple, because men's deeds were evil. Yet light, though not excluded, should not be allowed to glare upon the eye, for this would destroy the pathetic sentiment of which we have spoken, and interfere with the quietness of mind, and realization of a Presence not of this world, which it is desirable to foster.

All this with reference to the general architectural design. There remains the question of pictorial or other Adornment. Here the lessons of the past should be of some avail, although to the analyzing thought and philosophical spirit of the present day, painting and sculpture, as aids to worship, may seem innocent, or even advantageous. All things we may consider are permitted to us if we are not brought under the power of any. It may be speciously argued, for instance, that since it is impossible to approach the Divine Being, even in so spiritual an act as prayer, without an ideal image of a personality before the mind as the recipient of our worship, which will be shaped according to the culture and capability of the individual, and will generally, therefore, be a gross and miserable caricature, why not supply by the language of Art, what in oral or written language is abundantly done, representations, worthy as we can render them in human guise, of His majestic attributes? Nothing could be more vividly anthropomorphic, it may be said, than the language and belief permitted to the Hebrews respecting Jehovah; and Christians, in order to a true and loving communion, are encouraged to picture to themselves a Father whose ear is ever inclined to His children's cry, whose eye is ever upon them, whose hand ever guides and guards them. Why then refuse the aid of the highest art at command

in depicting such an ideal of Paternity? There is already of necessity, it is urged, an "Ideolatry" if God is to be adored at all; why not furnish the mind with shapings of the Infinite One that may help it to grasp more closely the object of its love? True, the Hebrews were absolutely forbidden to fabricate a graven image; yet why was the one, the mental image, permitted, and the other, the material image, prohibited? Or if the idolatrous ideas of that day rendered its permission inexpedient for the Jews, is it so to us? The case is an extreme one, but it may cover much of the same kind. Part of the answer consists in the hard literalness, and consequent degradation, of a spiritual fact, when presented in form and colour; just as a doctrine, consigned too rigorously to verbal definition, solidifies in process of time into an impracticable tenet. Part of it may depend upon the absurdities which result from translating rhetorical figures into the language of Art. "Riding upon the wings of the wind" is grand in poetry, but its incongruities stare us in the face when put upon canvas. Part, again, may lie in the impossibility of clothing, without degradation, Supreme or any spiritual existence with bodily shape, as the attempts even of the highest art upon this particular subject have sufficiently shown; attempts which, it may be observed, did not commence till Christian ideas had become grossly material. But the weighty part of the answer lies in the localizing power of all such representations. The Universal Presence disappears before the local presence. "The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men," is the ready cry of the multitude, and the worship of that likeness immediately begins, which changes it into a Fetish, the actual present source of mysterious power. The verbal picture raises indeed in each man's mind an image of personality, but the fact that it is variable, vague, incongruous, and individual is its safety. Whatever may be each man's mental image, there is no common image set up for adoration. Every one, whatever his outward association with fellow-worshippers, "prayeth in secret to Him who seeth in secret." There may be a common apprehension of a Presence, but each individual pictures that Presence in the recesses of his own mind, and the great truth retains its integrity that God is a Spirit.

ART AND RELIGION.

To those who believe in the divinity of our Lord, and who would render Him worship, the same argument would apply, though modified by the fact of the Incarnation. An art record of the Incarnation of a certain kind is innocent and commendable; but if it is brought into contact with worship, it destroys the proper conception of Him who fills all things, and by whom all things consist; and interferes with the true spiritual relation of Christ to the individual soul. If it was expedient that in His bodily presence He should go away, it is not expedient that by art representation we should so bring Him back as to set Him in our midst, to be seen and handled, and to suggest the notion of a local presence. The singular absence of all particulars of personal appearance, in the otherwise minute and living narrative of the Gospels, has been often remarked upon. But it is noticeable how those who had known the Lord in the flesh, were gradually weaned from that earthly attachment. How, after His resurrection, although for a time visible in the body, He came and went in a manner so mysterious and sudden that there was awe and silence, and mutual questioning; and amid all their slowly attained assurance that they had seen the Lord, the consciousness that He was not what He had been to them in the days of His humiliation. Even these interviews did not last, but were followed by visions of the heavens opening, as to Stephen at his stoning, and to St. Paul going to Damascus; while at last even the beloved disciple, when he saw the glory of Him on whose breast he had leaned at supper, fell at His feet as one dead. If then we set up the semblance of the suffering or dying Saviour amongst us, if we familiarize ourselves with all that was human and temporary, we reverse the process to which the disciples themselves were subjected. We shall lose in reverence, or we shall adore as they did not adore even the living Saviour; for they adored Him only in His spiritual presence, and His eternal glory.

These considerations tell against that familiar use of the crucifix which some admire, especially when they see it for the first time at every road corner abroad. Great are the dangers of familiarity with a crucifix, as with a phrase! The water that serves for the common use of a village in Tyrol,

ART AND RELIGION:

flows from the wound in the side of a life-size image of the Saviour; pails and dishes stand under it! What remains to such a symbol except the superstition which turns it into a local Fetish?

It is, then, only in the shape of records of the Incarnation that pictorial art seems admissible in a Christian church; that is to say, if at all, it must be historical, displaying scenes from the Lord's life as He wrought His mighty works before the multitude, or sat and taught them; or from the events that prepared His way. Not isolated representations of Him, unless under the simplest of poetic and allegorical forms, such as delighted the early Christians. The remembrance of some of those majestic figures in mosaic which glimmer in the apse of ancient churches is indeed tempting; but such a figure at the point towards which every worshipper turns would be fraught with danger if human nature remains as it has been. The great difficulty of the simplest Gospel scenes remains in the inadequacy of such picturings, in any but first-rate hands; and again the charm, in such hands, of the Art itself; while in any case the gay distraction which would await most minds on entering a church so decorated, would be indisposing to the introverted and yet upward gaze which should be the attitude of each.*

To sum up the whole of this part of our subject in a word. We hold that the office of Art, architectural and pictorial, in a building devoted to religious worship, should be limited to the production of that fitness which acts with the gentle suasion of sympathy. Just as a summer Sunday morning, with all the soothing influences of surrounding nature,—the temple which God himself has built for us, rich in beauty, and yet subdued to pathos and mystery,—prepares the mind for Sabbath services; so, in its limited measure, should the building which human hands devote to His worship. As we enter its gates with praise, the architecture and adornments should with reverent subordination harmonize with and support our thoughts, its walls of peace enclosing and sheltering us from the occupations and gay tumult of secular life, and suggesting other and higher things. Art should never attempt to rule our thought, but only

* As witness the highly frescoed church of St. Boniface at Munich.

to sympathize with and cherish its aspirations. And such, no doubt, is exactly the impression produced in most of those sanctuaries throughout our land which we have denounced for their pagan construction ; and such is not the impression, for the most part, of those which represent amongst us the spiritual forces of Christianity. But there is no reason why the sweetness and chaste propriety of architecture of those older buildings should not be dissociated from the Christian fetishism that governed their erection, and still fatally lingers within their walls ;—no reason why Gothic or Lombardic forms of roof, of window, of column, should not be applied to buildings in which no trace of that fetishism is permitted.

Nonconformists, however, partaking of the art-culture of the nation, and striving to avail themselves of architecture beautiful in itself, and consecrated by association, have too often adopted with it forms which express what they most repudiate. The result is not merely inconsistency, but often a ludicrous bathos. As when an organ is incontinently thrust into the holy place adapted for the altar and its mysteries ; and the pulpit, appropriately enough placed on one side to open uninterrupted view of the more important functions of the altar, is still retained there when nothing is to be seen beyond but a row of singers ! These are degrading falsities. The new spiritual wine cannot be poured into the old bottles of superstition. The mere adoption of mediæval forms, when the meaning has departed, or is expressly repudiated, is small credit to the skill of the architect, or the intelligence of the people. Scarcely less lamentable is it to see machine-made imitations of ancient ornament thickly crusted over a building inside and out, with no other object apparently than to make it smart or costly ; to display the wealth, the pretensions, certainly not to foster the piety of the worshippers. Far better would it be to set up again the plain unadorned barn of a “Bethel”—far better, if Art-beauty in any degree interfere with the spiritual purpose. What sort of Bethel was it that that plain man Jacob—so inferior to the chivalrous Abraham, or the intellectual Isaac—set up at first, and yet found it the very gate of heaven ?

The general course of our remarks has been devoted to the

ART AND RELIGION.

evils that have sprung from the association of Art with Religion; but nothing in this world is allowed to be wholly evil, or destitute of positive good. We catch hints of a process such as this: A commencement from some natural impulse, and for a good end; a fulfilment for a time of a useful function; then degeneracy, or development into abuse and evil; but, finally, when this has worked itself out, a residuum of good in the general consciousness of mankind. It was so with the monastic institution, and perhaps with the establishment of religion in alliance with the State. So with Religious Art, even in its objectionable applications. Confining ourselves to the Christian developments of it, we see that it began in a natural expression of Christian feeling, and took the useful form of a pictorial Bible; and we may admit that even the literality and grossness of spiritual conception which it eventually fostered, might for a considerable time assist the faith, and control the passions of gross minds. More unequivocally we may acknowledge a general residuum, which though perhaps hard to define, is very real and helpful, though unconsciously and through much infiltration, to each man's realization of the spiritual world, or of the great events of a supernatural dispensation. The additions, absurdities, profanities, may be all dismissed, and there may remain what it would leave us poorer to discard. We need scarcely instance the sublime and touching ideas that Gothic ecclesiastical architecture has bequeathed to us. It was devoted to the elaboration of a singular perversion of Christianity, but it was too pure a thing for that perversion; when it was completed, the architecture of pompous pagan Rome was found more appropriate to a Romanizing Christianity. All that was beautiful in Gothic remains to be appropriated by a purer faith. But turning to representative Art, how much do we not owe to the thousand years' accumulation of portraiture of our Lord? Here Art, as has been hinted, had a more legitimate field than in other of its attempts, since Christ in the body of our humiliation, did once tread this earth, and we may suppose ourselves by means of Art put in the position of those who had seen the Lord; and though it is noticeable how little these availed themselves of that privilege for spiritual uses, and we know of the greater blessing signifi-

ART AND RELIGION.

cantly pronounced upon such as "have not seen, and yet have believed," we cannot feel otherwise than grateful to the Art that has given us a type of form so commending itself to the imagination, and now so sacred that no painter dares to vary from its main features. Nor could we spare that ideal of female purity and maternal sorrow which the long devotion of Art to the Virgin has provided for us. Nor the triumphs of martyrs, nor the saintly emaciation and ecstatic reverie of men and women who overcame the world, though it were in cells and deserts. Nor can we cease to treasure all those expressions of devout feeling and divine hope, those evidences of faith in the unseen and the eternal, that the successive ages of Christian Art have embalmed for us—vitiating how much soever by mistaken sentiment and perverted belief. This vast series of Art representation, limned or moulded by thousands of hands, has provided types of moral beauty precious to all the generations that may behold them.

We may doubt whether sacred Art will ever possess such a vantage-ground again. While people held to perfectly definite and material ideas upon religious matters; while the old pagan belief in tutelary powers attached to places and things was strong; while everybody lived on the edge of miracle or supernatural appearance; while saints and devils were busy all about, and might be next door; while heaven was a place not far above the clouds to the inhabitants of every neighbourhood, and hell not far beneath their feet;—Art, stirred by the same vivid convictions, could picture these things with a simple realism justified to itself, and accepted by beholders, as literally answering to the fact. Art worked with a power in having such materials to its hand. Now, even to the reactionists of the day, this literalism is no longer a truth. Knowledge of the round world has destroyed it, chasing away the mysteries of dark corners. Science has destroyed it, explaining strange sights and sounds, exhibiting the mechanism of things, and lifting up the heavens millions of miles above our heads. Ethics have destroyed it in opening juster views of the Divine operations and methods. More than all, spiritual life, which refuses communion with other than the

ART AND RELIGION.

Father of spirits, has helped to break its bonds. Indefinite mystical conceptions pervade everywhere, and with this immense change the functions of sacred pictorial Art, as they have been understood, are paralyzed. All hard lines of belief are softened away, and in spiritual things the lines of the painter and solids of the sculptor are become distasteful. The representative Arts in this field yield more and more to music and poetry, which can deal better with the intangible, the vague, the emotional, welling up from unknown depths. A "Christian Year" now supersedes the Pisan frescoes, and notwithstanding the strongest bias towards the mediæval Church, its imagery is full of the sweetness, the pathos, the mystery of nature. The mediæval ages of Art will not then return to us, except in a few quaint revivals of its fancies in such hands as Mr. Rosetti's, which appeal only to the special tastes of those who are familiar with the mediævalisms they repeat.

It is quite otherwise with Fetishism, which in different forms the rudest and the most cultivated have shown themselves prone to fall into. Archbishop Manning is reported to have said that Protestants would never believe that Catholics were not idolaters till they removed all images and pictures from their churches, which for a time he was quite ready to do. So he might, for the fetishism that clings to them is feeble compared with the fetishism of the sacred bread. The representative image is susceptible of plausible justification as not necessarily implying idolatrous worship—in which argument, however, the intelligent Brahman is quite as acute and effective on behalf of his gods, as any Catholic for his saints. But, the Host, is not representative of God; it is Divinity itself. The Lord is there upon the altar, a "real presence" in a material object, and therefore the purest fetish, and therefore the very essence of idolatry. This belief is returning upon us through other than Roman channels. It answers the chief purpose of the idol, while avoiding the appearance of idolatry; for it bestows what imperfect faith desires, the bodily presence of deity. And it does so in a manner exactly suiting an age which cannot believe in bleeding images and winking pictures, but which can believe in the inspiration of a table leg, and

ART AND RELIGION.

which has been taught by science to trace all phenomena (and why not those of the new birth?) to physical causation. We all know how ingeniously every quack assumes in these days a scientific jargon, how every error clothes itself in a philosophic garb; and the wafer mystery is defended in exactly similar style; while a spice of the mystical and vague equally fits the temper of the time. We may still expect, therefore, that Art will be called upon to serve this delusion, which does not need the picture or statue, but does require the altar, the Holy Place, and a priesthood to serve at them with all the resources of *spectacle*. All these are ready to hand, in the buildings bequeathed to us, and in those now faithfully copied from mediæval times. They have never ceased to foster the principle of what has been well called the "invisible miracle," which is only a legitimate extension of that fetishistic belief in the transmission of spiritual gifts by finger and thumb lying at the root of the milder doctrines of apostolical succession, and the virtues of sacraments administered by certain hands. Well may such men as Archdeacon Denison on the one side, and the late Dean of Canterbury on the other, agree in declaring that "two religions" are at this moment struggling for the mastery in England. It is so, the religion of the Bible, and the religion of the Church—that of the soul and of the sacraments;—the antithesis may be put a dozen ways, but it suits our argument best to say, the *religion of Paganism* and the *religion of Christianity*. Our choicest art, as regards Church buildings, Church adornment, Church ritual, is put at the service of the former. While this is the case, its innate fetishism is ever more firmly lodged amongst us. The conflict begun in the first ages of the Church is far from ended. The lump prevails instead of the leaven.

We can only add a word, before we close, upon a large subject, the illustrative Religious Art of the present day. We have been obliged to confine ourselves to Art as connected with worship, the earliest and the principal historic association of Art with Religion. This has been a priestly and authoritative application of it for the most part. But ever since the Christian era—the era of individualism—there has appeared a

ART AND RELIGION.

strong individual element in Religious Art. It was first shown in the art of the catacombs; it was further exercised in the safe retreats of religious houses, where devout and diligent fingers worked out those innumerable conceits of the divine life, sacred mysteries, allegories, and histories, of which manuscript illuminations are composed. Then came the art of the designer for wood or copper, expanding into the abundant stream of art illustration that floods our own time. All these are—must be, if there is any value in them—individual utterances of thought and emotion upon religious matters. In their number at least, if seldom otherwise, they make a great utterance. Some of it belongs to that reaction against the ruthless iconoclasms of the “*Zeit Geist*” which has contributed to revive amongst us mediæval ecclesiasticism; but the greater portion consists of purely biblical illustration, or biblical symbol. Intended for private use, these appeal to individual feelings and preferences. Devoid of Church authority, or of the possibility of fetishistic value, they answer to a pious craving, and carry with them a gentle current of religious thought and suggestion through the homes of the land. Some incident of the divine history, or phase of the Christian life, has struck the owner, as it was portrayed in print or picture, and he fixes it upon his wall, an unobtrusive but perpetual reminder. Such illustrations educate the young. They refresh the careworn heart, they help the mind to realize events which, however distant, are of ever-present moment. They will thrill at some chance moment with a spiritual truth. They do not distract the functions of worship; still less do they profess to guide them. These therefore afford a legitimate field for all the wealth of art ability spread through cultured communities; they supply it with the noblest themes, and increase the company of preachers. But it must needs be genius that is thus employed—genius that can produce a “Christ in the Temple,” a “Light of the World,” a “Christus Consolator.” Vulgar religious art, sentimental art, will only degrade and emasculate,—as much in the boudoir and school-room as in the Church. And after all we come back to the old vital question, “What shall it profit a man if he gain the

ART AND RELIGION.

whole world,"—of wealth, or rank, or knowledge, or art,—
"and lose his own soul?"—if he forget that all the appeals
of Art to the imagination, all the sympathies and ecstasies it
may excite, are as nothing—may be worse than nothing—in
the great transaction between himself and God?

RULE OF FAITH;

OR,

CREEDS AND CREED.

RELIGIOUS controversy is a sore perplexity to many minds.* Such ask, "Why all this disputation? Will it never cease?" It is strange, at first sight, that the agency which is designed to harmonize should become the occasion of so much discord. Few covet warfare for its own sake, yet love of ease has a great deal more to do with hostility to discussion than has love of peace. For good or ill, whether we desire it or not, stagnation is of the past, and we are launched on an age of religious disturbance and conflict, and each man must do his duty.

So far as we can see, there is small comfort for men whose supreme need is a paradise of quiet indulgence. Controversy in the domain of religion will never end among men. There is this difference between the fortunes of religion and science. Science broadly contrasted with religion exhibits a more regular progress in seizing and holding the truth with which it is conversant. Science, of course, has often to reconsider and revise its conclusions; and the Church, taken as a whole, has achieved a stable advancement in the apprehension of the truth committed to its study. Still, admitting this qualification, there is this general dissimilarity between the scientific and the religious world, that, as a whole, scientific men do *not* go back to early errors which have been abandoned, and reproduce them in their

* All works cited in this essay will be, as far as possible, such as are accessible to the English reader.

current teaching; religious men *do*. Expounders of science are not likely to maintain any more that the earth is a fixed centre, and that the sun, moon, and stars revolve around it; nor will they assume again that the substance of the globe is mere blank matter containing no records of our planetary history. The same cannot be said of the guides of religious thought. Pernicious errors which were exploded long centuries ago have been, and will be, revived again and again. They will be advocated afresh, after slumbering for ages, and eager votaries will anew profess and diffuse them. Old superstitions and unbeliefs of manifold shades, at the present moment, are multiplying their disciples throughout our land. How shall we account for this peculiarity in religious history? False conclusions are never slain. They are struck down for a while, but they always rise up again. There are, indeed, comparative pauses in polemical activity. Sometimes it rages; but it never rests.

What is the explanation of this phenomenon? The spiritual state of the Christian Church does not embody a steady and unbroken progress, and lapses into erroneous doctrine are the signs of internal fluctuations and changes. Religious questions are never speculative inquiries merely. Moral sympathy or moral antipathy supplies the impulse and governs the tendency of all intellectual activity in the Church. Whether the correct apprehension of Christian doctrine advance or retrograde, the understanding is always a subordinate agency in the process. The moral feelings and dispositions guide us to the convictions by which we are controlled. Here lies the clue to the elucidation of the fact, that infidelities and heresies repeat themselves so frequently. Scepticisms and misbeliefs are never substantially novel. At the most, they are old foes with new faces. When their conditions reoccur, they themselves will reappear. The same general circumstances, with the ordinary amount of particular variation, will restore the spirit of the past in the forms of the immediate hour. There is a species of fungus which grows in dark cellars, and there are errors of distinctive types which spring up when moral light declines, and which flourish in the shade. Their vitality or decay is due to the circumstances which either offer the means of life, or which render their existence precarious and impossible. So, many precious

RULE OF FAITH.

truths resemble the plant which withers in the drought, unroots itself from the soil, and is blown hither and thither a circular tangle of wiry and lifeless fibres. When the rains return, it resumes its vitality, grasps the earth anew, and clothes itself in verdure with magical rapidity. Whether seemingly languishing or extinct doctrines shall lie in the dust, or break forth again in tropical luxuriance, is wholly a question of conditions. The moral state of the Church must determine.

While we hold that Church history is the record of this law, none of us can apply it to individuals. Acquiescence in orthodox dogma may accompany a reign of death. In an epoch of unsettlement, like our own, many erroneous opinions on very grave questions may be associated with reverent loyalty to truth. Grievous mischiefs are being propagated by men whose names we venerate. While the predominant source of religious opinion is moral, influences too numerous, too subtle, too manifold to be recounted, concur in shaping the expression of human convictions. At all times, and under all circumstances, God is our only Judge.

In the year of our Lord 1871 we are compelled to ask once more, What is the rule of faith? Have we a Divine informant? If we have, what is it? These old questions some men are again revolving with new doubt, agitation, and solicitude; others with new faith and patience, and with strong expectation of coming good.

In the pages which follow we shall endeavour to set forth the logical merits of the Papal and Anglican estimate of Protestantism. But while we shall resolutely dispense logical justice to those from whom we differ, we must not be supposed to be unconscious of the mistakes and excesses with which Protestantism, as a concrete reality, is justly chargeable, nor of the facts which seem to constitute the strength of the Roman Catholic and Anglican representations. We are aware that it requires no small measure of genius, and something more than impartiality, to transport oneself into the exact situation of another, to see with his eyes, and to surround his opinions with the warmth of his own consciousness. If we have failed to clothe ourselves with the sympathies of those to whom we are so strongly opposed, it is only after repeated and habitual effort

RULE OF FAITH.

to realize the charm which fascinates so many other minds. It is inhuman never to cross the threshold and survey the ground which multitudes of our fellow-creatures account sacred.

We can join even Dr. Littledale in his condemnation of the folly, the divisiveness, and the sectarianism of the extant Protestant Churches.* To him, of course, these disfigurements are the essential fruits of Protestantism; to us they are its separable accidents. We, too, pant for unity; but we think it neither desirable nor practicable according to the ideal of Oxford or Rome. Let none imagine that we are insensible to the causes which have driven long centuries of human beings to seek repose in ecclesiastical infallibility. It is a shallow theory of history which exhibits only a designing priest on the one side and a credulous multitude on the other. "There shall be *like people, like priest*,"† is the true construction of ecclesiastical experience. No real student of truth will ever underrate the peril, the difficulty, the strain, and often the agony of its pursuit. Not a few would be ready to confess that if there had been a harbour of refuge from this and many a dread responsibility besides, they doubtless would long ago have run into it. There is sufficient in human nature and in the human lot to account for resort to professed infallible guidance. We turn from the Romish and Anglican shelter, because we believe it to be a *mirage*, and not a *rest*.

I. THE RULE OF FAITH.—There is no *via media* between the parties in opposition as to what constitutes the rule of faith. We must either be Protestants or Papists. We must accept the authority of God or the authority of man. A long line of able and scholarly men in the Episcopal Church have endeavoured to rear their Christian beliefs on both. The attempt is fatal: the logical and practical goal is Rome.

We abide by the conviction that the Bible is the sole external rule of faith. The Bible, and not merely the New Testament, is the plenary and sufficient guide of the religious life. The annals of the old and new covenant form a concrete unity, and constitute the record of one unfaltering special Providence. Historically, the one dispensation ran on for a distance into

* *Vide* "The Two Religions," and "Church and Dissent."

† Hosea iv. 9.

RULE OF FAITH.

the other, and organically the imperishable substance of the former remains the permanent heritage of the latter. Is our blessed Lord Prophet, Priest, and King? Obviously, then, the last office of the Old Testament and the first office of the New were united in the mediatorship of Jesus Christ. Paul did not hesitate to say, "Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."* The Old must not be disparaged to extol the New. We cannot understand Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets, without Christ and the Apostles; nor comprehend Christ and the Apostles without Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets. Some profess to accept the present dispensation, but disclaim all interest in the past. We cannot afford to drop a single fact out of the earliest inspired documents. Every one must be caught up and carried forward in the process of all adequate interpretation. The Lord Jesus cannot be severed from Abraham and Adam, to say nothing of Moses. The rationalistic vivisection of the inspired word is fatal. Death will speedily terminate the experiment of the critical operator. Life will survive neither in the fallen head nor in the decapitated trunk.

II. THE RULE OF FAITH AND THE HOLY SPIRIT.—When the Protestant says, "The Bible *only* is the rule of faith," does he exclude the Holy Spirit? Nay, verily; only spiritual men can interpret spiritual truth, and only the Spirit of God can make men spiritual. A competent student of the Holy Scriptures must have a moral consciousness in harmony with the inspired documents. We accept the aphorism "*quod pectus theologum facit.*" We should prefer "*conscientia*" to "*pectus.*" The primary organ of reverence and practical religion is the conscience. The sense of sin is the first work of the Holy Spirit in the soul, and the fundamental qualification for penetrating the meaning of the Divine word. A man will not wander far from the mind of the Spirit who is faithful to the sense of sin begotten by the Spirit. It is manifest that many who have launched on the troubled sea of theological speculation have affixed the dread and awful name of sin to what in their sensibility is only a trivial peccadillo. The tap-root of various growths of error consists of low views and feeble convictions

* Rom. xv. 8.

RULE OF FAITH.

of man's sin, and low views and feeble convictions of God's righteousness. The mind to which sin is little, will not, *cannot* appreciate a great Saviour and a great salvation. Some who claim to be considered Christians do not believe even in sin.

In demanding for the Bible sympathetic study, we are merely requiring what is conceded to every other production. High art spurns any but cultured discrimination. One without an ear for sweet sounds is no authority in melody and harmony. Would you subject Shakspeare to the artificial judgment of a French dramatist? Of what value would be a criticism on "Paradise Lost" by the mathematician who asked, What does it *prove*? A mind *en rapport* with the truth is indispensable to the theologian.

To what does this tend? we must have the Biblical consciousness in order to make the Bible the rule of faith. Of whatever the Scriptures may be the rule, to any one without the Spirit of God, it cannot be the rule of *faith*. Where there is not the "*fides qua creditur*," the "*fides quae creditur*" exerts no regulative force. The man has not that within him of which the outward truth is the guide. "The fruit of the spirit is . . . faith," and his nature has not borne it.* By the "*Bible only*" we intend the Bible is our sole external standard, but we must have the Spirit of God within.

Sympathy with Divine truth in virtue of the indwelling Spirit of God is not the monopoly of either clergy or laity. It is the common property of Christian men. It is the Christian consciousness shared by all believers which is the grand qualification of the clergyman to discharge the duties of the sacred function. His genius and learning are only the inseparable accidents of his office. When our Lord breathed the Holy Spirit on His disciples, and entrusted them with their wonderful commission, He had laymen before Him as well as apostles.† The origin of the diaconate is very instructive, and especially to those who maintain that the deacon received a *clerical* function. It was what the seven were as Christian laymen which was to fit them for office. They were to be "men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost

* Gal. v. 22.

† Comp. Luke xxiv. 36—43; and John xx. 19—25.

RULE OF FAITH.

and wisdom.”* These are the requirements of all Christian persons. The deacons were simply to exhibit them in such eminence as to obviously qualify them for the specified duties. These characteristics were not to follow the laying on of hands. Their lives as laymen were to have developed these excellences already beyond all doubt; and the great lay multitude, raw, inexperienced, and complaining, yet having the Spirit of God, were to be the exclusive judges of these high qualities, and their suffrages were to elect the men whom the apostles were to designate to office by prayer and imposition of hands.

III. THE RULE OF FAITH, APOSTOLIC TRADITION, AND CATHOLIC CONSENT.—There must be an interpretation of the Bible. Roman and Anglican Catholics insist that they possess an authoritative interpretation as well as an inspired record. The authoritative interpretation is supposed to have its internal and external guarantees. Romanists and Ritualists claim episcopal grace within, and apostolic tradition and Catholic consent without. The Bible is the rule of faith. The authoritative interpretation must, therefore, be the rule of the rule of faith. Where is the rule of the rule of the rule? Surely the rule of the rule needs far more decisive authentication than the inspired rule itself. What is the meaning of all this? That the word of God is very obscure and insufficient, and the Spirit of God in the Christian man is an uncertain and wavering light, if indeed it be not darkness. Ecclesiasticism must depreciate the Bible to exalt itself. We are told, without hesitation, “The Scriptures are worth no more than *Æsop’s* fables, without the Church’s authority.”

The “*fallacy of references*” has achieved many unworthy and impermanent victories in polemical citations from the Fathers. Tradition is something communicated and handed down, but it represents a totally different notion in early patristic literature from what it does in the speech and writing of the modern Papist and Anglican.† The early Fathers never dreamed of raising ecclesiastical tradition to a place of co-ordi-

* Acts vi. 3.

† *Vide* Schaff even, notwithstanding his strong Church leanings. “History of the Christian Church,” vol. ii. p. 606, sq.

RULE OF FAITH.

nate authority with the Holy Scriptures, much less of exalting it above them. They believed in the fulness and adequacy of the Biblical revelation.* It was simply an hermeneutical tradition to which they appealed, and not to a second and independent source of Christian doctrine.† Nothing could be more foreign to the spirit and practice visible in the remains of the early Church literature than the idea of *another* authoritative standard of Divine truth. The early believers and guides acknowledged none but the inspired Scriptures. They would have been filled with astonishment and horror if they had read modern Papal and Tractarian assaults on the plenary teaching of the word of God. As usual, extremes meet. Unbelievers may learn to their entire satisfaction, from the labours of Romanists and High Church Anglicans, the utter insufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for the moral and spiritual illumination of mankind. If the Bible without the authoritative interpretation be so dubious and imperfect an instrument, it is only natural, consistent, and humane to discourage, and even prohibit, its reading among the laity. Impotent for good, it must be efficacious enough for evil. To put into the hands of the people what their reverence will stimulate them to examine, but which they are sure to misunderstand, is perilous. To place the Scripture under ban for the multitude is as right as it is politic, if it be so imbecile to enlighten and so mischievous an agent to lead astray. The modern Papal treatment of the Bible was the inevitable issue of the earlier Papal theory of the Bible. Formal and pronounced hostility to the reading of the Scriptures by the laity did not occur until the Romish Church was losing all power to control the process and its results. The Tractarians must arrive at the same goal.

It was perfectly natural for men close to the apostolic age to refer to apostolic example. The Gospel at first was oral and unwritten, and the Christian Church was founded without a New Testament. But the Church could not be reared on an unrecorded tradition. The progress of the truth among men developed new circumstances. Further wants grew out of a

* *Vide*, at large, Westcott. "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels." Appendix B.

† *Vide* Westcott. *Ibid.*, p. 402, note 1.

RULE OF FAITH.

more advanced condition of the Church. Personal and public needs led to the production of written evidence. The living voice was inadequate to the requirement, and the witnesses and their companions reduced the substance of their testimony to writing. God wrought no miracle where the ordinary laws and processes of human life under His providence were of themselves sufficient. Theophilus desired more than broken oral reports, and Luke, his accomplished friend, wrote his Gospel. Matthew's Gospel could reach more Jews than his ministry could overtake. Later, the atmosphere was thick with the germs of subtle error. The venerable apostle John could not traverse the threatened regions where disciples had multiplied, but his Gospel could proclaim the Logos, hold forth the Light, and unfold the Life.

It was not wonderful that men who listened to the apostles or to their immediate converts should cite during their life what the apostles had uttered. But mere oral tradition soon vanishes altogether, or becomes hopelessly disguised and perverted. There is an embodiment of Christianity in our day which it has often struck us might be used very effectively to illustrate many problems in early Church history. Methodism is a form of Protestant Christian life almost uniquely grafted on affectionate veneration for a well-known person, namely, John Wesley. It is now about a hundred and thirty years since the founding of Methodism. John Wesley was then about thirty-six years of age. This apostolic man lived to see his eighty-eighth year. He has been dead, therefore, about eighty years. No memory is so reverently cherished in any Christian circle as that of John Wesley in Methodist communities. Yet what has come down, even in the innermost life of Methodism, of the sayings and methods of John Wesley which does not rest on *written* authority? The words of Luke to Theophilus are noteworthy: "It seemed good to me . . . to *write* . . . that thou mightest know the *certainty* of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed."* The *traditio oralis* is a quicksand. It is in the *traditio scripta* only that we can find certainty. *Litera scripta manet.*

Now while unwritten tradition is worse than valueless as an

* Luke i. 3, 4.

RULE OF FAITH.

independent source of doctrine, the hermeneutical tradition as we have called it—the traditionary interpretation—may be appealed to with some amount of confidence within *certain* limits and for a *brief* period. There has been an interpretation of Wesley's works in the Methodist body from the beginning. The traditionary understanding of Wesley's writings amongst his immediate followers and their successors could be cited in conference without fear of contradiction. So, for a time, it was possible for the immediate followers of the apostles to affirm, "we set forth the apostolic construction of the truth." But there is a notable distinction between apostolic and Wesleyan traditionary interpretation. In the age immediately succeeding the apostles, the Church had not passed much beyond the simple perception of the simple facts of the Gospel. The vast problems lying at the back of the primitive realities were to a great extent latent and slumbering. When John Wesley arose, centuries of intense intellectual activity had been expended on the metaphysics of the Christian faith. Wesley himself was a skilled theologian. He constructed a sharp, angular, and denominational creed. Methodist dogma is settled to the end of the world. From the nature of the case, it is incapable of expansion.

The New Testament,—and indeed the whole Bible,—is the contrast of a creed. It is a record of facts. Of course, principles are underneath, but they have to be elicited and expressed by reflection and study. Christian doctrine has to be developed by the application of the ordinary laws of inductive research in the hands of spiritual men. God communicated the Gospel facts through inspired teachers; Christian theology proceeds from the activity of the Church itself, under the ordinary evangelical grace of the Holy Spirit. The revealed facts are insusceptible of addition; the Church's apprehension of the truths which they enclose has been a process of growth from the beginning. The Church did not start with a theology, but with a Gospel,—not with a creed, but with a revelation. Paul formulated Christian doctrine so far as contemporary antagonism, whether from Jew or Gentile, demanded it. The Hebrew Greek theosophy of Alexandria probably occasioned John's enunciation of the Divine Logos, and the elements of a

RULE OF FAITH.

nebulous and unfixed Gnosticism seem to have required the composition of his first letter. But beyond this, the Church, animated by the Spirit of God, had to make its own way. Each successive controversy was practically novel. Resort to traditionary interpretation soon became irrelevant and worthless. The nature of our blessed Lord was the subject of the first conciliar creed. Men had not before *systematically* determined whether our Lord was human only, or divine, or divine and human, or certain nominal or real modifications of either or both. Believers had always worshipped Jesus Christ as their Divine Lord. Now, doubt and faith, truth and error, were in conflict on points acknowledged on all hands to be of vital consequence. Of what avail in this exigency was hermeneutical tradition? There was none to refer to. These questions had not been raised in the apostolic Church, nor in the patristic Church immediately following. The Church had passed beyond and outgrown its earlier helps. The Bible, from the nature of the case, was the only and final authority. What the constituents of our Lord's person really are must be deduced from innumerable realities and statements which appear to assert or imply His Deity. The New Testament age and circumstances were far different from the days and peculiarities of the empire under Constantine the Great. But devout study was perfectly competent to determine the main features of the truth involved in the facts and implications of the inspired records, and equally fitted to apply it to relieve the difficulties and hush the strife of the passing hour. By a similar process the assumed but unpronounced conviction of the patristic Church in the past could be ascertained concerning the dogmas in agitation.

But the appeal to tradition soon became something more than the citation of the ecclesiastical exegesis. It grew in time into another source and standard of Christian doctrine. It was not till towards the middle of the fifth century that tradition was formally announced as the authoritative rule of Church teaching. Vincentius Lirinensis, or Vincent of Lirin, or Lerina, was the first to construct the plea of tradition into a canon of interpretation. Born of a noble family, at Toul, in French Netherlands, he became a soldier, and afterwards a monk on the

island of *Lérins*, now St. Honorat, off the modern department of Var. His famous canon occurs in the well-known "*Commo-nitorium*," etc. It is generally believed that his treatise was directed against what he deemed to be the novelties of Augustine, Vincent himself being a semi-Pelagian.* The Commo-nitorium of Vincentius was republished at Oxford, with a translation, in the earlier days of the Tractarian movement, and his celebrated work was one of the guiding lights of Anglo-Catholicism. That he would have adopted the conclusions which his Anglican admirers ascribed to him is more than doubtful. His words do not warrant that even he ever designed to raise tradition to the authority of a Divine informant. The rule of Vincent is—"Within the Catholic Church itself, we are greatly to consider that we hold that which has been believed *everywhere, always, and of all men*: for that is truly and properly Catholic, as the very force and nature of the word doth declare, which comprehendeth all things in general after an universal manner; and that shall we do if we follow *universality, antiquity, consent*."†

Yet Vincent did not question that "the canon of Scripture is perfect, and most abundant of itself, sufficient for all things."‡ Though Vincent appeals to what is believed "by all," he does not mean "*all*," but only a small number. He qualifies: "Consent shall we follow, if we hold the definitions and opinions of all, or at any rate almost all the *priests and doctors* together."§

We must come down to the Council of Trent, in the sixteenth century, for the full Roman Catholic claim of a divine informant additional to the written word. The Anglo-Catholic must repair to the Tridentine decrees. Vincentius is insufficient.

* *Vide sub Vinc. Lir.*, Smith's Dic. Greek and Rom. Biog. and Mythol., where this is disputed.

† Oxford trans. 1837. "In ipsa catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus quod *ubique* quod *semper* quod *ab omnibus* creditum est. Hoc est etenim vere proprieque catholicum, quod ipsa vis nominis ratioque declarat, quæ omnia fere universaliter comprehendit. Sed hoc ita demum fiet: si sequamur *universitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem*."

‡ Ibid. "Cum sit perfectus scripturarum canon, sibi que ad omnia satis superque sufficiat."

§ "Sequemur . . . consensionem, si . . . omnium vel certe pene omnium *sacerdotum* pariter et *magistrorum* definitiones sententiasque sectemur."

RULE OF FAITH.

"The most holy Œcumenical synod seeing that the evangelical doctrine and polity are contained in the written books and those unwritten traditions which were received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or, emanating from the apostles themselves, at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, and delivered down from hand to hand, have descended to us, following the example of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with a like feeling of piety and reverence all the books as well of the Old as of the New Testament, since one God is the Author of both, as also traditions themselves, as well those relating to *faith* as those relating to *manners*, as either uttered by Christ or dictated by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the Catholic Church by an uninterrupted succession."*

Practically, even the canon of Vincent superseded the word of God in the hands of all who adopted it. The Divine rule is always *overruled* by the ecclesiastical. To the principle of the monk of Lérins we oppose the following objections:—

1. *Ecclesiastical tradition, according to theory, represents only the prelatical and priestly consciousness.*—The *Christian* consciousness, the consciousness of the *Church*, namely, that of *all Christian men*, is not consulted. Now, the prelatical and priestly consciousness, whether Papal or Anglican, is the most unfortunate to which the Christian community could appeal. An exclusive, privileged, and irresponsible order of men are the last in the world to give an impartial deliverance on Scriptural interpretation. As a rule they are sure to make their prerogatives the centre of their theological system. Only one argument need be adduced in proof of this assertion, and that is—they are *men*. The ample confirmation of our conviction is—*all Church history*, and *British Church*

* *Vide* Goode's *Divine Rule*, etc., vol. i. p. 79. "*Sacrosancta œcumenica synodus . . . perspicuiens hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis acceptæ, ab ipsius apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt: orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam veteris quam novi testamenti, cum unus Deus sit auctor, nec non traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, tamquam vel ore tenus a Christo vel a Spiritu Sancto dicatas et continua successione in ecclesia catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia, suscipit ac veneratur.*"—Concil. Trident., Sess. iv. Decr. 1.

RULE OF FAITH.

history in particular. The prelatical and priestly consciousness is the consciousness of the few and the most warped and unreliable of any accounted Christian.

2. *Tradition supersedes a direct and immediate interpretation of the word of God.*—Nothing can be more foreign to the spirit and design of the revealed Scriptures. It not only discourages the study of inspired truth by the people, but renders it unnecessary, if not intrusive. It presupposes that the examination of the Divine records is no part of the vocation and responsibility of the Christian *man*. Like the rest of sacerdotal religion, it is all to be done for him. The natural result, as asserted in an earlier connection, is to place the reading of the Bible by the laity under stringent interdict.

3. *If the alleged tradition were an uncorrupted oral revelation, it would be unnecessary.*—It could not be opposed to Scripture, and must after all be brought to the test of the only Divine standard. Hence Roman Catholics make intense avowals that they do not contravene the teaching of Scripture. They often betray that curious and contradictory consciousness, so characteristically human, which loudly asseverates that all is right when it is not so clear within that there is no wrong, and which stoutly protests that all is safety, while not without the sense of hovering danger. "We admit no tradition that is contrary to Scripture,"* says Bellarmine. "We never defend traditions that are in conflict with Scripture."† Where then is the utility of tradition?

4. *What is called tradition is commonly some injurious growth which has gradually encrusted and disfigured the truth.*—It is usually the product of fallen human nature, and fosters its most fatal weaknesses and corruptions. It is agreeable to the timid, the credulous, and the indolent to commit themselves to a system which relieves them from the trouble of inquiry. It coincides with the fatal distrust of the Holy Spirit in the Church which seems to be indigenous to the relationship of ecclesiastical rulers. It is also gratifying to the thirst for

* "Nec ullam traditionem admittimus contra Scripturam." De verb. Dei. lib. 4., c. 3.

† "Nec enim traditiones cum Scriptura pugnantes unquam defendimus." Ib., c. 11.

RULE OF FAITH.

ghostly dominion which cleaves to every priesthood. To become the sole depository of the revealed mind of God guarantees an easy, direct, and secure access to ecclesiastical power.

Because tradition is a thing of evil origin and evil influence, it is disparaged and condemned in the word of God. When Paul enjoins conformity to tradition, he is simply recalling *his own* utterances as a *living* authority.* The earliest sample of tradition in the New Testament resembles ecclesiastical tradition generally. "Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die."† It was reported, believed, and false. Tradition, whether as a secret or public means of Divine knowledge, apart from the palpable authentication of an inspired messenger, is without favour in the sacred Scriptures. We meet with it opposing Christ. The Scribes and Pharisees demanded of Him, "Why do Thy disciples transgress the traditions?" "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?" is the reply of the Infallible One. His closing sentence sets forth the unvarying mischief of tradition ever since: "Ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition."‡ Tradition was the bitter root of Paul's most afflicting memories. "Above many my equals, . . . being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers."§ He warns others, "Beware lest any man spoil you . . . after the tradition of men."|| Peter, reminding his readers of their past life, describes it as "your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers."¶

Human nature exhibits the same general characteristics in all countries and under all religious systems. Mohammedanism, Hinduism, Buddhism, each has its traditions. The mechanism of the human mind will work in but one way; and the main external features of the woven fabric display little variety. All religions run a similar course, and record a like history.

* 1 Cor. xi. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 16, A.V., has "ordinances" for *παράδοσις* in 1 Cor. ii. 2.

† John xxi. 23.

‡ Matt. xv. 2, 3, 6. So Mark vii. 3, 5, 8, 9, 13.

§ Gal. i. 14.

|| Col. ii. 8.

¶ 1 Peter i. 18, *πατροπαράδοτον*.

RULE OF FAITH.

The earlier dogma is overlaid by traditionary accumulations. The later elements are always the baser; and the degenerate material is invariably the more powerful. The primitive ingredients in the end are practically cancelled by the latest of all, which are sure to constitute the living and ruling influences of any system.

The old and new economies of revealed religion embody these laws of human nature. In the days of our Lord, Judaism had reached the stage when the traditionary and corrupted element was the controlling force in the national life. Religious activity was never more abundant. But it was exuberant vitality coiling over ruin. Ecclesiastical tradition stands in precisely the same relation towards the Church as pharisaism towards the ancient covenant. What the Hebrew elders were to Moses, Roman Catholics are, and Anglo Catholics must become, towards the Lord Jesus Christ. The pomp and splendour of the last Œcumenical Council may be all glory to some eyes, but it is only the phosphorescence of decay.

What, then, is our hope for the Gospel? Is it to be buried in the grave of human inventions, and a tangle of traditionary briers be all that remains for the weary heart and troubled life of man? Nay, verily. Our faith was never so buoyant. The spirit of God in believing men, and a living interpretation of the word, are the Divine agents of rejuvenescence for the Church in all its declensions and decays.

5. *Tradition requires a standard exterior to itself, and nothing, therefore, is gained by it.* If a written revelation be so obscure and insufficient as to need a *second* rule, how much more must the second and *unwritten* rule, whether it be traditionary facts or traditionary interpretations, need a *third* rule? This is not a subtle cavil, but a most practical inquiry. There were rival traditions. Heresy and orthodoxy both appealed to tradition. What is the criterion of *the old* original? If you could verify *the old* original, by what canon is it to be expounded and applied? Even a traditionary *interpretation* must be *interpreted*. Irenæus is the earliest Father who appeals to tradition as something additional to the written word. But he resorts to it as an *argumentum ad hominem* addressed to the Gnostics. Historically, the heretics preceded the ortho-

RULE OF FAITH

dox in the use of tradition. Irenæus seized their weapons and turned them against them. But they have proved double-edged, and have been far more mischievous than serviceable. Irenæus writes, "When, however, they"—the heretics—"are confuted from the Scriptures, they turn round and accuse these same Scriptures as if they were *not correct, nor of authority*, and [assert] that they are *ambiguous*, and that the *truth cannot be extracted from them* by those who are ignorant of tradition.* The very argument of Romanist and Anglican! The Father then proceeds to cite counter-tradition. As reputedly orthodox and heterodox tradition so soon emerges, it is plain that some stable and unfluctuating criterion of truth must be found to apply to both.

The quotation above evinces that Irenæus relied on the inspired word as the *instrument of defence*. Tradition in his own hands was a most untrustworthy medium of reporting evangelic fact and dogma. For example, he maintained that our Saviour lived till fifty years of age, though no biblical student could be found to extend it beyond thirty-three years and a half. To this period, he declared, "He still fulfilled the office of a teacher, even as the Gospel and all the elders testify; those who were conversant in Asia with John, the disciple of the Lord, [affirming] that John conveyed to them that information. And he remained among them up to the times of Trajan. Some of them, moreover, saw not only John, but the other apostles also, and heard the very same account from them, and bare testimony as to the [validity of] the statement."† But the Father did not rest with assertion. He fancied that he discovered inferential proof of the tradition in the Gospel nar-

* "Quum enim ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non recte habeant, neque sint ex auctoritate, et quia varie sint dictae, et quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his, qui nesciant traditionem.—Adversus Hæreses, lib. 3, cap. 2." *Vide translation in Clark's Ante-Nicene Library.*

† After stating that from forty to fifty a man declines to old age, he continues: "Quam, i. e., aetatem seniozem, habens Dominus noster, sicut evangelium et omnes seniores testantur, qui in Asia apud Joannem discipulum Domini convenerunt, id ipsum tradidisse eis Joannem. Permansit autem cum eis usque ad Trajani tempora. Quidam autem eorum non solum Joannem, sed et alios apostolos viderunt, et hæc eadem ab ipsis audierunt et testantur de hujusmodi relatione.—Adv. Hæreses, lib. 2, cap. 22, sec. 5." *Vide Clark's Ante-Nic. Libr. for translation.*

RULE OF FAITH.

rative, which he proceeded to set forth.* He conceived it to be necessary to the work of Christ that His life should be prolonged to the verge of old age, and deduced from the tradition an evidence of the adaptation of the Gospel to the wants of humanity. "For He came to save all through means of Himself. . . . He therefore passed through every age, becoming an infant for infants . . . a child for children . . . a youth for youths, etc. So likewise He was an old man for old men, that He might be a perfect Master for all, not only as respects the setting forth of the truth, but also as regards age," etc.† Here we have a tradition circumstantially proclaimed, on the highest authority and with the greatest solemnity, and yet palpably false. The reasoning by which it is fortified is worthless, and the efficacy which it is supposed to impart to our Redeemer's mission is without warrant and unnecessary. Tradition at the outset did not promise to become a rule of faith.

6. *The resort to tradition is a pernicious endeavour to get rid of the ordained conditions of human life.*—Christian teachers are bound to bring all errors to the test of the only standard of truth. But it is not an easy task. Departures from the Gospel are many, varied, subtle, and ever assuming new aspects. Infinite wisdom has devolved on the Church, and especially on the instructors of the people, the duty of exhibiting the harmony of orthodox dogma with the written authority. The faithful are accountable to expose erroneous teaching by applying to it the selfsame test. The responsibility is an arduous one, but there is no lawful escape from it. We must address ourselves to it with humility and prayer, with faith, courage, and perseverance. It was to secure an easy ecclesiastical method for disposing of heresy that Vincentius constructed his rule. He says, "Inquiring often with great desire and attention of very many excellent, holy, and learned men, how and by what means I might assuredly, and, as it were, by some general and ordinary way, discern the true Catholic faith from

* John viii. 57.

† "Omnes enim venit per semetipsum salvare. . . . Ideo per omnem venit aetatem, . . . infantibus infans factus, . . . in parvulis parvulus, . . . in juvenibus juvenis, etc. Sic et senior in senioribus, ut sit perfectus magister in omnibus, non solum secundum expositionem veritatis, sed et secundum aetatem."—*Ibid.*, sec. 4. *Vide Clark, ibid.*

RULE OF FAITH.

false and wicked heresy; to this question I had usually this answer of them all, that whether I or any other desired to find out the fraud of heretics daily springing up, and to escape their snares, and willingly would continue in a sound faith, himself safe and sound, that he ought, two manner of ways, by God's assistance, to defend and preserve his faith; that is, *first, by the authority of the law of God; secondly, by the tradition of the Catholic Church.* . . . Very necessary it is for the avoiding so great windings and turnings of error so various, that the line of expounding the prophets and apostles be directed and drawn *according to the rule of the ecclesiastical and Catholic sense.*"* If vigorously applied, the canon of Vincentius would beyond all doubt answer the design of its framer. So far as the ecclesiastical interpretation was right, it would assuredly fix it beyond the reach of disturbance. But it would at the same time petrify all that was mistaken and false in the ecclesiastical tradition, and would render all further development and definition of doctrine impossible. All methods of guiding the Church, contrived in the interests of ecclesiastics, may procure temporary ease, but will ultimately ensure greater disaster, and are most likely to end in shipwreck. The fulfilment of severe and exalted responsibility is the only condition of arriving at truth, and abiding in peace.

7. *We resist the Romish and Anglican abuse of tradition because it is unwarranted by the Catholic consent of the Church, and is inimical to Catholic unity.*—Catholic consent, in the full sense of the words, is unattainable till the day of judgment. The Church has not yet arrived at the final apprehension and expression of Christian doctrine. Catholic consent is, therefore, beyond our reach. Men who resolve to square all

* Vincent. Lirin. Commonit. Oxford Trans., 1837. "Saepe igitur magno studio et summa attentione perquirens a quam plurimis sanctitate et doctrina praestantibus viris, quonam modo possim certa quadam et quasi generali ac regulari via, Catholicae fidei veritatem ab haereticae pravitate falsitate discernere, hujusmodi semper responsum ab omnibus fere retuli: quod sive ego sive quis alius vellet exsurgentium haeticorum fraudes deprehendere, laqueosque vitare, et in fide sana sanus atque integer permanere, duplici modo munire fidem suam Domino adjuvante deberet. *Primo scilicet, divinae legis auctoritate: tum deinde Ecclesiae Catholicae traditione.* . . . Multum necesse est, propter tantos tam varii erroris anfractus, ut propheticae et apostolicae interpretationis linea *secundum Ecclesiastici et Catholici sensus normam* dirigatur."

RULE OF FAITH.

living conviction according to what they call Catholic consent simply array one consent against another,—a past, narrower, and inferior consent against a future, broader, and nobler consent.

Great endeavours have been made to base Catholic consent on antiquity. But who are the ancients, and who are the moderns? Bishops Ken and Van Mildert claimed antiquity for the first 800 years, while Archbishop Bramhall and Bishops Jewell, Hall, and Cosins restricted antiquity to the first 600 years. Archbishops Laud and Usher adhered to 400 or 500 years. Waterland and Beveridge specified the first three or four centuries. Hammond and Stillingfleet accepted the first six general councils. Who is to draw the line between ancient and modern? It appears that the inspired word is *one* Divine informant, and tradition is a *second*. We need a *third* Divine informant to assure us what is antiquity. Neither Scripture nor tradition can tell us. Anglican doctors are divided. Our legislators have been equally disagreed. "The directions given to the Bishops from the Lords of the Council in the year 1582" adopted the first six centuries, while "the Act of the first year of Elizabeth especially names the first four general councils (A.D. 325—451).^{*} All *three* Divine informants must be interpreted, which requires a *fourth*.

A Catholic consent, in the sense of a past general agreement, there must have been in the Church, so far as the faithful have been under the guidance of the Spirit of promise. But Catholic consent, as it is called, is constantly put to the curious use of authenticating what is *not* Catholic. Episcopacy, priesthood, sacramentarianism, and related modes and dogmas are the *very things* about which consent is *not* Catholic. Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Methodists, and many besides, are as really Christian, to say the least, as Romanists, Greeks, and Anglicans. Catholic dogma must be what all real Christians hold in common. The Fatherhood of God, the divinity and humanity of our blessed Saviour, His sacrifice for sin, and the indwelling life of the Holy Ghost in the faithful, are cardinal doctrines for which something like a Catholic consent may be claimed. Roman and Anglican

^{*} *Vide* Newman on Romanism, etc., Lect. 8.

RULE OF FAITH.

sectarianism have no claim whatever to Catholic consent. Episcopacy, Convocation, Independency, Presbyterianism, and a Legal Hundred are all matters for which Catholic consent cannot be pleaded.

A Christian man would be bound to pause before breaking away from a fact or a dogma for which the Catholic consent of all the centuries of the Church could be fairly asserted.

Catholic consent can never be attained in the Romish and Anglican direction. It would be easy to fill pages with citations of Father against Father, Council against Council, and Pope against Pope. Men can be brought together only through what they hold in common. To thrust on us papal and episcopal singularities is the act of schismatics. The first condition of Catholic unity is to assign the pre-eminence to the truths to which we consent, and in all other things agree to differ.

IV. THE RULE OF FAITH AND INFALLIBILITY.—The assumption of infallibility on the part of the Romish Church is the natural and logical issue of her prior claims to be the sole authoritative interpreter of the Scriptures. A body of men empowered to declare the mind of God in the revealed word, with the certainty and binding force of the original inspiration, must needs be under infallible guidance. When ecclesiastics found it convenient, they asserted their infallibility, just as they proclaimed their monopoly of apostolic tradition, when circumstances seemed to demand it.

The personal infallibility of the Pope, lately voted by a conciliar majority, is simply the completion of the process. The uncertainty as to where infallibility resides had long been a defect and a source of weakness. As long as any believe in the personal infallibility of the Pope, a fixed centre of authority will impart unprecedented strength to the papal system. But the descent from the sublime to the ridiculous is proverbially facile; and some infallible idiot may before long perpetrate some grand official absurdity, and the whole thing may explode with a suddenness which may startle us all.

The profession of infallibility, like the previous ecclesiastical device, despoils men of their inalienable responsibilities, and attempts to reconstruct from their foundations the conditions of human life.

RULE OF FAITH.

A hundred sufficient arguments rush into one's mind against this monstrous dogma. There is one, however, which has been indistinctly seen and insufficiently pondered, and that is—if there be an infallible refuge for our bewildered humanity, *there is no way into it*. The doctrine is—the Church is infallible; we are bound to yield unreasoning credence to her teaching, and the exercise of private judgment is unwarrantable. It is forgotten, however, that there are many Churches. Which is the infallible one? If one be infallible, how am I to recognize it, and by what means shall I enter it? The Church or Churches which profess infallibility deny me the right of private judgment. How then am I even to consider *their* claims? Unfortunately, whether my private fallible judgment be good or evil, celestial or satanic, it is all that I have, and no other man has more. There is no infallible private judgment, but without it how can I find my way into an infallible Church? According to those who assert the need of infallibility, the imbecility of human reason, although seeking Divine guidance, is such, that a man is sure to stumble in the wrong direction. Even if I were fortunate enough to penetrate by chance into the right edifice, I should have no means of verifying it, except through the use of my private fallible judgment. I should have to content myself with the *moral assurance* that I had arrived at safety, and be left to occupy precisely the same level of certainty as those who make no pretence to infallibility.

There are rival infallibilities. How am I to know the *infallible* infallibility? The fact is, all human beings are alike, and we can receive no conclusion except through an act of private judgment. It is an act of private judgment to deny the right of private judgment. It is an act of reason to abjure reason—an unreasonable act of reason doubtless, but yet an act of reason. We are obliged to accept the very authority which forbids the exercise of private judgment by an act of private judgment. We can connect ourselves with a Church which calls itself infallible, and which abjures reason, only by the *felo de se* of reason, namely by a suicidal act of private judgment. How does any one become a Romanist? Because in his fallible private opinion the Papal Church is infallible. How does he continue in the Romish Church? By the same

RULE OF FAITH.

means. Has the priest a higher guarantee for his conviction than the layman? None whatever. It is his fallible private belief that his Church is infallible. It is the private and fallible judgment of the Pope that he is officially infallible. The majority in the late council who voted the Pope infallible simply expressed their several private and fallible judgments. There is no escape from private judgment. If one renounces one's own private judgment, one must simply accept the private judgment of another. It is only raising one fallible conviction above another.

One is tempted to inquire, how a conclave of ecclesiastics, individually fallible, could endow by a show of hands one of their number with infallibility? If five hundred destitute paupers were to club together their penury, it is not easy to see how they could transmute their emptiness into affluence, and vest its application in one of their own company. But let that pass, and much besides.

Ecclesiastical infallibility, whether a fancy or a fact, can commend itself to nothing but fallible private credence. If there be an infallible Church, it lies outside the circle of human affairs, and is unapproachable by human beings. It is a curious piece of rational and moral irony, that a man must be a Protestant, and exert the right of private judgment, even to become a Papist and renounce it. He must begin in fallible individual inquiry, to end in blind surrender to infallibility. The light of reason must guide the hand to put an extinguisher on reason; just as life only can take away life. A dead man cannot destroy himself—the living brain lifts the arm that blows out the living brain.

There must be the private exercise of reason to bring a man inside the ecclesiastical pale that puts a ban on reason. The edifice of uninquiring credence leaves an opening big enough for reason to crawl through on all-fours, though too small for reason to pass in erect and undishonoured. Every argument addressed to men in defence of Romish infallibility is an appeal to the individual reason and private judgment, which, according to theory, are incapable of pronouncing on what is fallible and what is infallible. No ingenuity can construct a bridge to span the impassable gulf which must for ever yawn between an

infallible Church and the private judgments of fallible mortals. It is fatal to the temple of infallibility that it rests on the foundation of private judgment. All rational men must pause when they find that every aspect of the Church of Rome exhibits only Protestant gateways and Protestant portals.

The crystalline logic of Chillingworth has sorely grazed the equanimity of Mr. Newman. To what straits is he driven in his last work! "I may be certain that the Church is infallible, while I myself am a fallible mortal; otherwise, I cannot be certain that the Supreme Being is infallible, until I am infallible myself. It is a strange objection, then, which is sometimes made to Catholics, that they cannot prove and assent to the Church's infallibility unless they first believe in their own."* It would be amusing and sorrowful to compare Mr. Newman's Anglican "Lectures on Romanism" and his Papal "Grammar of Assent;" but we forbear. What a chapter of contradictions might be cited! How odd it sounds to hear Mr. Newman say, "I may be *certain*"! That a consciousness so drifting should be capable of temporary assurances so dogmatic is a strange psychological phenomenon. Mr. Newman avers, "I may be certain that the Church is infallible, while I myself am a fallible mortal." How? Would that he had condescended to tell us! If a lunatic proclaims his rationality, or an enthusiast his divine inspiration, or Mr. Newman the Church's infallibility, what guarantee have we of the claim in either case? Simply the *ipse dixit* of private judgment, or rather of private fancy and credulity. Mr. Newman's former Anglican certainty, or his present Romish certainty, are purely subjective and private, and he can commend them to nothing but to my subjective and private criticism.

When Mr. Newman adds, "Otherwise I cannot be certain that the Supreme Being is infallible, until I am infallible myself," one is reminded how soon men come to the edge of blasphemy when they assume high Church pretensions. Having ascribed to the Church one of the incommunicable properties of the Almighty, the Deity and the Church are placed on the same platform of evidence, and may be talked about in the same breath without any shock to reverence. Extremes

* "Grammar of Assent," p. 218.

RULE OF FAITH.

meet. The servility and presumption of reason join hands. Its arrogance and abasement go together. The infallibility of God is a first truth of inspiration, reason, and faith. It can neither be proved nor disproved. So it seems is the infallibility of the Church !

But Mr. Newman has failed to see, or has forgotten, wherein the whole difference lies. There is but *one* God, and reason *cannot err* in ascribing to Him infallibility. But these are the problems to which Mr. Newman expects us to bring equal certainty. *Is there an infallible Church ?* If there be, *which* is it ? According to hypothesis, reason, even while asking for divine light, is broken, impotent, and blind ; and yet it is *as* broken, impotent, and blind, that reason is to lift herself up and pronounce with unerring precision on such high matters as fallibility and infallibility. We must be masters of the properties of infallibility ; we must be competent to say that there is an infallible body in the world, and that our discernments are adequate to detect the actual corporation which absorbs it to the exclusion of all others. If reason be equal to that in its smitten and helpless condition, it does *not need* infallibility ; and if in its crushed ineptitude reason is beyond the reach of ecclesiastical succour, then infallibility is *unavailing*. Infallibility is Chesterfield's patronage of Johnson, which the lexicographer spurned with such honest indignation. While a man is "struggling for life in the water," it can do nothing. "When he has reached the ground," it "encumbers him with help." To resort to ecclesiastical infallibility is to close one's eyes, set one's teeth, and take a leap in the dark. In an evil world, and with no superfluous faculties and aids to guide our accountability, the issues of such an act of despair must be dismal indeed.

There is nothing "strange" in the "objection, which is sometimes made to Catholics, that they cannot prove the Church's infallibility unless they first believe in their own." The objection is both natural and unanswerable. Why, according to Romanists, is infallibility necessary ? Because devout reason applied to inspired Scripture is a false and ruinous guide. Since, then, reason is incompetent, and the Bible insufficient, how can a poor creature, with nothing but rationality, prayer, and the

RULE OF FAITH.

word of God, become a judge of fallible and infallible Churches? He *must* himself be personally infallible.

Some may think that Protestantism is open to a similar objection, because it rests on an infallible Book. But the retort is nullified by the fact that no Protestant pretends to announce an infallible interpretation. An approximation to truth in our religious judgments, sentiments, and actions is all that is attainable in this world. The Book must enshrine a revelation infallible as its Author. An infallible interpretation would re-arrange human life, and debase and finally destroy the Christian Church. An interpretation will more truly reflect the mind of God according to the sincerity and prayerfulness of the man or the age that produces it. Spiritual perception is in proportion to spiritual sympathy. As men grow, and as the world grows, interpretation will advance. The individual and the race are only slowly and progressively penetrated by the light of revealed truth. It seems necessary that one doctrine should be clearly and fully expanded before another. There is a distinct order in the evolution of dogmas embodied in the history of the Church. An infallible interpretation closes the Book. Inquiry is profane; conscientiousness is impertinence; dependence on God is superseded; and the Holy Spirit in the Church is an unexplainable superfluity.

Our lowly approximation to truth is all that is necessary for the *practical ends* of life. Romanists and Anglicans can consistently claim no more. They believe in a development of doctrine which involves that many dogmas now sharply defined were held in past centuries as mere approximations to truth. Does not this fact involve the fallibility of their previous notions? May not even these conclusions assume new shapes under definitions yet in reserve? Nay, more; many Romish and Anglican dogmas are absolutely novel, and in direct conflict with the documents from which they are avowedly derived. There were periods when they were not even incipiently discerned, and when they were blanks to the thought of the Church, which is a greater infirmity than imperfect apprehension.

After all, Mr. Newman has so far placed before us the correct

RULE OF FAITH.

issue. We accept it. He has put together the infallibility of God and of the Church. We have nothing but our rational and moral faculties, devoutly and prayerfully exercised, to apply to either. It is by their means, so exerted, that we bow with all reverence to the former, and most religiously spurn the latter. We must rest in an infallible somewhere. Even Romanists credit us with the ability to discern infallible credentials, and we will use the endowments ascribed us with all humility. Having this capability, we think that we may fairly be left to direct it to the study of the infallible *word*. It is better to rely on the *certain* infallibility of God than on the more than doubtful infallibility of the Church which can offer us nothing but the "*commandments of men*."

V. THE RULE OF FAITH AND PROTESTANT TRADITION AND INFALLIBILITY, OR CONFESSIONS, CREEDS, AND CATECHISMS.—Creed, from *credo*, meant in simple and sincere days that which a man *believes*. We *must* interpret the word of God. A statement of the truths which we discover by pondering the Scriptures is a creed. The most elementary facts which you may present to the most uninstructed inquirer are so far a creed. A creed cannot be better defined than as "*a declaration of those things most surely believed among us*"—a setting forth of the beliefs which we have derived as a Christian community from a devout study of the inspired documents. Exact representations of Christian doctrine as embodied in Church symbols are of great worth. They crystallize, as it were, into distinct and compendious forms the diffused results of prolonged inquiry and conflict. Creeds are an immense contribution to clearness of thought, and are condensed records of laborious and systematic study, by the greatest and best of men, to arrive at the mind of God. In the main, orthodox creeds are the repositories of precious truths, ripened by the theological energy of the Church, and garnered for the service of the faithful. No one ought to disparage them. Except by the ignorant and presumptuous, they will be held in veneration. Only rash and raw neophytes, or men of exorbitant vanity and self-sufficiency, whom experience has not chastened, and truth does not promise to subdue, will turn a deaf ear to the voices of the past. That there should be no creed at all is a *creed*. Doubtless a

RULE OF FAITH.

brief one; and while it rejects much which is evil, it retains nothing which is good. That Christianity is independent of doctrine is a *doctrine*. We are sometimes exhorted to abandon the thralldom of dogma altogether, and to ascend to the pure region of sensibility and emancipation, "which is, being interpreted," Abjure *your own* dogma, and accept *my* dogma instead.

How do we arrive at civilization but by wisely accepting the labours of our predecessors, and by intelligently carrying on their work? Christian theology is possible on no other conditions. Creeds should not be departed from, in their most minute particulars, without prolonged and solemn consideration. But still they are human and fallible, uninspired, and without Divine warrant; and no man, and no body of men, may forge them into chains to shackle the Church, or exalt them above the sacred word, which alone exhibits the seals of supreme authority.

But the most noteworthy fact in the arrangements and transactions of ecclesiastical bodies is the *abuse* of creeds, and not the *use*. There are two ways of employing a creed. It is sometimes important for Churches to state what they believe. But when we think it expedient to proclaim what we generally hold, our confession of faith is without ecclesiastical authority, and no one is required to bind himself to it by subscription. For the sake of distinction, we call that a declarative and unsubscribed creed. Congregationalists have often published a creed of this nature. A few years ago such a creed was issued from the Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. Not long since a similar document proceeded from the Congregational Union of America. The other method of applying creeds, and which we conceive to be a misuse of them, is when they are issued by a governing ecclesiastical body, are stereotyped in all their doctrinal articles and grammatical syllables for all time to come, and clergymen are sworn to their entire contents by subscription. We name that, as discriminated from the former, an authoritative and subscribed creed. There must be some truths held in common as the basis of fellowship. The mutual acceptance of these, be they many or few, involves the confession of a creed.

It is as *authoritative* and *subscribed* that creeds will be

RULE OF FAITH.

opposed in the following pages, whether verbally denoted or not. For numerous and grave reasons we resist their imposition. Many objections we must be content to state, and leave without illustration.

1. *There is no creed of any kind in the Bible.*—There are facts which imply doctrines, and there are doctrines themselves announced in various connections. But doctrinal truths are set forth in circumstances very different from our own, and in opposition to errors remote and foreign to our times. Underlying assertions of fact and expositions of doctrine there are spiritual laws and logical inferences which may be seized and constructed into doctrinal propositions and systems. But you have no detailed and formal creed in the Scriptures. Christian theology is not much more unfolded in the inspired volume than physiology in man, botany in the vegetable kingdoms, and astronomy in the heavenly bodies. The Bible is concrete, not abstract. It deals with Providence, history, life, fact, and experience, not with *science*, whether physical or metaphysical.

The form in which it has pleased the wisdom of God to give us a revelation cannot be an accident. If the presentation of elaborate dogma had been "a more excellent way," we may presume that it would have been vouchsafed to us. The enforcement of a creed by man on man seems to be prohibited by the very constitution and contents of the sacred record.

2. *There was no creed at all in the Apostolic and early Patristic Churches, much less a creed based on subscription and allied to ecclesiastical authority.*—There were palpable facts and spiritual realities accepted by the Christian communities. Society, whether religious or secular, is as impracticable as it is undesirable, without a foundation of beliefs held in common. We would not lay great stress on the absence of authoritative and subscribed creeds in the first Churches, if they could be shown, on revealed principles, to be scriptural and expedient. We do not feel bound to reproduce every particular usage of the early Churches without exception, nor to abstain from every practice for which their example cannot be explicitly cited. But we regard the peculiarity before us as entering into the essential character of the earliest Christian communities. Certainly, Romanists and Anglicans who so loudly boast of apos-

RULE OF FAITH.

tolicity, antiquity, and catholic consent, are bound to exhibit their warrant for so startling a departure from scriptural and primitive example.

3. *The Bible*—and especially the *New Testament*—appeals to the individual sense of responsibility, which devolves on every one, in each succeeding age, the obligation to interpret the Scriptures for himself, with such aid as he can personally command.—Christianity, as the blossom and crown of a great providential process, is a religion for the world. Now what is its peculiar spirit, unique and unshared by any other system, whether false, or the true corrupted? The Gospel addresses itself to the individual consciousness of moral obligation, and achieves its victories through the personal convictions of men. Each man is to enjoy the fruits of his faith, or to bear the consequences of his unbelief. "If I say the truth," demanded our Lord, "why do ye not believe me?"* On another occasion He averred, "If any man is willing to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God."† We find Him also reproaching some for their ignorance of their state before God, saying, "Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?"‡ "He that rejecteth me," He asserts, "the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day."§ These sayings are all the more remarkable, because they were spoken to men who were out of sympathy with our Saviour's teaching, and yet under obligation to understand and appreciate His words.

The apostles adopted the same demeanour towards men. Paul's highest idea of his office, announced under most solemn and affecting circumstances, was: "The ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel."|| His manner of fulfilling it was: "By manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience."¶ Hence he expected each man to become personally and intelligently cognisant of his relationship towards God in Christ. "*Examine yourselves*," he

* John viii. 46.

† Ibid. vii. 17, ἐὰν τις θέλῃ . . . ποιῆν.

‡ Luke xii. 57, ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν.

§ John xii. 48.

|| Acts xx. 24.

¶ 2 Cor. iv. 2.

RULE OF FAITH.

demanded, "*whether ye be in the faith ; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates ?*"* In consequence, the obedient Philip-
pians were exhorted : "*Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.*"† Paul told the Christian laity that they were able to "*know the [spiritual] things freely given of God.*"‡ Immature Corinthian converts, surrounded by the perils and pollutions from which they have been lifted, were admonished : "*Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall. I speak as to wise men ; judge ye what I say.*"§ Theirs was the danger, theirs the accountability ; theirs must be the decision, and theirs the consequences. The delicate and difficult task of discriminating the true from the false evangelical prophet was committed to the Christian commonalty. The office had fallen into contempt. "*Despise not prophesyings,*" said Paul, but "*prove all things,*" and "*hold fast that which is good.*"|| They were competent to discern both the reality and the semblance. They were under obligation to spurn the wrong and seize the right. They were to be superior to the folly of casting away the true in their scorn of the false. That would violate the introductory counsel, "*Quench not the Spirit.*"¶ John, later on, enforced the same duty, and presented a doctrinal criterion to be applied by the faithful : "*Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God ; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know we the Spirit of God : Every spirit that confesseth,*" etc.** The great day will exhibit the same accountability of each individual for his personal convictions and conduct. "*Every one of us shall give an account of himself to God.*"†† "*We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, whether it be good or bad.*"‡‡ That the word of God grapples so directly with the personal

* 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

† Philip. ii. 12.

‡ 1 Cor. ii. 12 ; compare ver. 15.

§ 1 Cor. x. 12, 15.

|| 1 Thess. v. 20, 21.

¶ Ibid. ver. 19.

** 1 John iv. 1—3.

†† Rom. xiv. 12.

‡‡ 2 Cor. v. 10.

RULE OF FAITH.

moral consciousness of every human being, and places his eternal destiny in his own hands, renders it incumbent on him to form his own Christian judgments, as he best may, and forbids all others to force on him the past religious beliefs of the dead, or the present religious beliefs of the living.

4. *The very nature of the inspired documents demands a living interpretation from every age.*—When you have carefully read a creed, you may throw it away. It has nothing more to communicate. The Bible can never be mastered. As to its contents, the Old Testament is the record of an ancient, foreign, and remote national life, prolonged through many centuries, marked by varied fortunes, and related to all the great oriental monarchies. It comprises a manifold literature, history, ritual, dramatic and lyrical poem, aphorism, and prophecy. Its introductory pages depict creation and the early course of human history, but wholly in subserviency to the religious ideas of which the Hebrews were the chosen medium for exhibiting to men. The New Testament begins with four brief collections of facts, deeds, words, and sufferings of our blessed Lord. Then we have a short account of the founding of the Apostolic Churches. A few letters follow, called forth by special and local circumstances. The mysterious and ethereal Apocalypse closes the whole. The mighty world of that date is reflected in these remains. A mere glance at the external form of this wonderful book makes it evident that its study can never be exhausted. It is related to the whole past annals of the globe, keeps all human learning alive, and gathers around it the growing treasures of universal erudition.

The manner of the Bible, moreover, is informal, unsystematic, and presents nothing rounded off and finished. Biography, history, prophecy, fulfilment, exposition, and doctrine lie scattered without arrangement, exactness, and completion. The Great Book is without preface, classification of subjects, chronological appendices, tables of contents, and indexes. The materials of all these things within certain limits are to be found in the Scriptures; but paths to discovery at various points disappear, and in some directions vanish altogether. History and biography even, to say nothing of the profound and subtle problems of biblical doctrine, are offered to us in a

RULE OF FAITH.

mode to compel personal study. Vast tracts of time are dismissed in a sentence. Only prolonged meditation can discern the human and providential significance of such pale and fragmentary lines of distant things. Memorials of individuals are colourless touches—*clues* to character, not *portraits* of men. Doubtless there is wonderful sharpness, force, and vitality in these marvellous sketches. They are instinct with spiritual energy and suggestion. But every man must fill them up for himself out of his own wealth or poverty. We have not even a "*Life of Jesus*." The phrase is a misnomer.

Church arrangements and Christian doctrines approach us in a similar style. The Gospel at first was oral and unwritten. The truth was proclaimed, and the Church founded by living witnesses. When the good news was published, and the Church extant, the substance of their testimony, probably to a large extent in the very manner in which they presented it, was committed to writing, partly by themselves, and partly by their hearers. The apostolical letters presuppose the knowledge of the Gospel received from the lips of the first preachers. These, with the historical fragment misnamed the "*Acts of the Apostles*," are our sources of theology and ecclesiastical life. Christian methods and doctrines, for the most part, transpire indirectly, incidentally, and often obscurely. Frequently very circuitous inferences alone can bring us near to them, and sometimes they need to be tracked along a dim line of dubious allusions. Truth presented in such a vehicle can never be seized and fixed in authoritative and subscribed creeds. Such instruments are exhaustive and final interpretations of the word of God. No man and no age are equal to such a task. The Bible is too full of God and Christ, nature and Providence, man and life, sin and salvation, law and grace, judgment and eternity. What pertains to universal humanity underlies every page. All the world must study it to the end. It comes with its lesson for every soul, and all must share the unfoldment of its meaning. There is easy reading for the lowly, and much "weariness of the flesh" for the student and the divine.

Then it must ever be remembered that creeds are always the products of action and reaction, which bear upon them the

RULE OF FAITH.

traces of strong pressure, and exhibit corresponding exaggeration. When true, they need to be toned by the variety and fulness of the Divine word. Perpetual interpretation is incumbent on the Church.

The contents of the whole Bible can no more be grasped and fixed by any man or age than can the visual phenomena of creation. It is a revelation "in many portions, and in divers manners."* To men and generations it is ever the same, never the same;—unchanging as land and water, light and vapour, but diversified as the ever-varying expression of mountain and valley, glade and forest, sea and sky. Besides, the mood, the experience, and the growth of the individual and the mass, of a generation and of long centuries, bring some truths into relief and cast others into the shade. On what an epoch of reaction are we launched! What opposite excesses abound! What an age were this to fabricate a creed, and bind it on the conscience of the Church! And yet, why not this as much as any other? "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to *every man* to profit withal."† With such a book for our rule of faith, we must have a living interpretation, must be content with fundamental agreement, must abjure minute and compulsory creeds, must expect many judgments, and in ecclesiastical separation must remain one in charity.

5. *The first creeds constructed by the Church were derived from the Sacred Scriptures.*—We claim the right to imitate primitive example. Whether the Church apprehended the truth correctly or incorrectly, it had at least a living interpretation. We must secure the like.

The "Apostles' Creed," as it is called, is the oldest which has come down to us. Rufinus, in the fourth century, was the first who pretended that it was apostolical. It can hardly be considered a doctrinal creed. It represents an unscientific acceptance of the great evangelical facts. With the exception of the article, "He descended into hell," all Christians could

* Heb. i. 1. Πολυμερως κ. τ. λ.

† 1 Cor. xii. 4—7.

sign it. For modern denominational purposes it would be utterly useless.

This symbol was not made at all. It grew. In all likelihood, it began as an oral summary of evangelical realities, increasing as time passed on. It was probably an expansion of Peter's confession, and of the baptismal formula.* With certain variations, it may be found in the remains of the Fathers. Irenæus and Tertullian are the first who record resembling summaries of the Christian faith. The oriental versions differ from each other, and from the western version. "The Apostles' Creed" known in Britain is the Latin form, with additions made by Rome, and bears the name of the *Symbolum Romanum*. Different Churches had different ways of expressing the common faith. No verbal creed was binding on all.†

6. *Creeeds are without the authority which modern hierarchies and ecclesiastical bodies ascribe to them.*—There is not even ecclesiastical warrant for enforcing them.

The Apostles' Creed was the spontaneous product of different Churches, and appears, as we have seen, in various forms. No council and no representative assembly of any kind either originated or authorized it. It is accepted by Greeks, Romanists, Anglicans, and Evangelical Protestants; and yet it was neither defined nor published by any authoritative corporation, whether local or general.

The Nicene Creed is the next. This creed, like the former, was deduced from the Scriptures, and cannot lay claim to Church authority. Whether, and how far, it apprehends the truth which it was meant to set forth, is a question which need not detain us. Our sole assertion now is, that it was not authorized by the Church. This creed was issued by a council held at Nicæa, a busy town on the margin of Lake Ascanius, in a wide and fertile plain of Bithynia. It met in the year 325. That it is without Church authority can be made speedily evident.

(i.) *The composition of the Council was opposed to apostolic*

* Matt. xvi. 16; xxviii. 19; Acts viii. 37.

† *Vide* Hagenbach, "History of Doctrines," vol. i., p. 38. Shedd, do., vol. ii., p. 428. Schaff, "History of the Church," vol. i., p. 258. Neander, do., vol. i., p. 417. Dörner, "History of the Person of Christ," first division, vol. i., p. 169, etc.

RULE OF FAITH.

precedent.—It was almost wholly clerical. The bishops only and their proxies could vote. The clergy are not the Church. The episcopate is still less the Church. A Church council must be a gathering of "*the visible Church of Christ*"—the whole "*congregation of faithful men*" on earth. All must be present, personally, or by chosen and *bond fide* representatives. Assemblies, in the New Testament, are popular, not clerical. All present in the upper chamber shared the election of an apostle. The apostles devolved the whole responsibility of selecting the seven deacons on the multitude. The council at Jerusalem concerning Antioch was a deliberative convocation of apostles, elders, and populace. All shared the discussion and the decision. They were guided solely by the ordinary grace of the Holy Spirit: they yielded to evidence, and voted according to the dictates of Christian prudence and fidelity. If they had been in possession of an inspired direction, they would not have been guilty of the profanity and folly of conducting a long and anxious process in order to ascertain their duty. The conclusion, in some miraculous manner not reported, was sanctioned at the close by the Holy Ghost.

(ii.) *The Church was without a visible head.*—There was no office extant which empowered any one to convene a council. There were great centres of co-ordinate and independent ecclesiastical rule. But, up to this time, a hierarchy with a chief pontiff over all, like that afterwards realized in the papacy, was unknown. A council, according to the approved ecclesiastical pattern, was impossible. The authority to constitute it did not exist.

(iii.) *The Council of Nicæa, as to its authority, was not even clerical.*—It was commanded to meet by the Emperor Constantine in the manner in which the Czar might order forth his hosts to war. Its sole foundation was the injunction of a layman. The previous year, the victories of Constantine made him master of the empire. But the Church was in schism and confusion through the Arian controversy. He had pacified the State by the sword, and he resolved to tranquillize the Church after a like soldierly fashion. Trinitarianism and anti-Trinitarianism were to him matters of indifference. He tried

RULE OF FAITH.

to persuade the conflicting parties that the essence of Christianity was simply trust in Divine Providence, and that the dogmas on both sides were unimportant things; and he blamed the ecclesiastics for troubling the people about such scholastic subtleties. Of course he did not bring the parties any nearer to harmony by this procedure. So he commanded them to assemble at Nicæa, that he might settle their differences.* If authority in religion be vested in *men* at all, surely it must be in *religious* men. Worldly authority over the consciences of men in matters of religious faith is despotic and cruel in policy, and in the light of Christianity is a profane absurdity. Yet Churches have accepted the supremacy of men like Constantine and Henry the Eighth. The authority at Nicæa was secular in origin and political in motive.

(iv.) *The constituency of the Council was defective, and not accordant to the complete hierarchical ideal.*—A large number of inferior clergy were present, some of whom shared the deliberations—presbyters, deacons, and attendants; and while they could not vote in their own right, some of them could do more. The young Archdeacon of Alexandria could carry more votes than not a few of the bishops, by his intellectual force, his earnestness, and his eloquence. There were present also confessors and hermits, who commanded extensive veneration by their ascetic holiness. In the earliest councils of the Churches presbyters were admitted. The lingerings of more primitive usage had not altogether disappeared from Nicæa. It did not reach the hierarchical perfection of an aristocratical conclave wholly episcopal. But that consummation will come in time.

(v.) *The Council was not œcumenical.*—It would not have represented the whole Church if all the bishops had attended. For while bishops were still chosen by popular suffrage, as they had always been ever since episcopacy made its appearance in the Church, yet they scarcely exercised a representative function. While somewhat deferential to public feeling, they nevertheless voted very much on their own responsibility as successors of the apostles; in other words, as "lords over God's

* On the absolute supremacy of the civil power, see especially the original quotations in Barrow's works, vol. iii., "Supremacy of the Pope," Suppos. 6.

RULE OF FAITH.

heritage." But the whole number of bishops present was at most three hundred and eighteen, or about *one-sixth* of the prelates in the empire. They were nearly all oriental bishops. The Latin Churches—that is, the whole Church of Italy, France, Pannonia, Spain, and Northern Africa, had only seven representatives. Two presbyters were the proxies of one of the Italian bishops, namely, of the Bishop of Rome. How could such a council claim œcumenical or universal authority?

(vi.) *The authority of the Council was not even Christian.*—The Emperor was not baptized. He would not be baptized till he was dying, because he could then wash away all the sins of his life at once. At last his baptism was heretical. We have treated him as a layman. But he was not even that. A layman is the contrast of a clergyman *in* the Church, and not *outside* of it. Yet the Emperor *convoked* the council, seemingly *presided* over it, *opened* its proceedings, *used his influence* to secure the desired issue, and *ratified* its decrees.

(vii.) *The spirit of the Council was eminently anti-Christian.*—The Trinitarian party gained over the Emperor, and its dogma was decreed orthodox; Arius and his followers were deposed from their ecclesiastical functions, and sent into banishment; the writings of the leader were publicly burnt; civil persecutions and punishments were dealt out to heretics, and even death, later on, followed departure from imperial orthodoxy. This was the origin of Church and State, and of authoritative and subscribed creeds enforced by civil penalties. It was a bad beginning.

The procedure of the Emperor did not secure peace. Many signed the Nicene symbol, from fear, who did not believe it, putting their own interpretations on its clauses—the uniform fate of subscription. The Nicene Council was not an end. It was a new beginning of the strife. It initiated half a century of determined conflict, in which anti-Trinitarianism gained the upper hand again and again. One emperor cancelled the action of another. Council was arrayed against council, creed against creed, and even Constantine against himself. It was not till the Emperor Theodosius the Great, in 381, convened the next

RULE OF FAITH.

council at Constantinople, that the Nicene Creed was completed and confirmed. A law was decreed that all Churches should be given up to the Trinitarian bishops, and the public worship of the heretics was prohibited. Orthodoxy triumphed. The Constantinopolitan Council, like the Nicæan, was unscriptural in composition, of lay origin, and without Church authority. It was less œcumenical than its predecessor. There was not a single Latin bishop present, and only a hundred and fifty Greek bishops attended. Of the Greek bishops, the Emperor summoned only men of the Trinitarian section. It was a packed jury, impannelled by the sovereign, and they voted according to his wishes. Its spirit was even more anti-Christian and despotic than that of Nicæa.

There is such a fact in the Bible as a *Balaam* made the vehicle of inspired prophecy. But the principle is exceptional. From a council pitifully *fallible* in spirit we could scarcely expect absolute *infallibility* in its decisions.

(viii.) *The Nicæan Council did not pretend to settle the questions in dispute by mere traditional and episcopal authority.*—While other influences were at work, the chief process which ruled the assembly was discussion; and appeal to the Sacred Scriptures was the staple of the arguments to which they resorted.*

Athanasius, the great disputant of the age, again and again, and under various circumstances, asserted the supremacy and adequacy of Divine revelation. The remarkable and often-quoted passage, in one of his orations, expresses his reiterated conviction, "The holy and inspired Scriptures are sufficient of themselves to make known the truth."†

(ix.) *Personal influence, as in all human deliberations, did the most to mould the issues of the Council.*—Official ecclesiasticism and deference to tradition effected far less. Above all were the imperial power and worldly sagacity of Constantine. Next came the genius of Athanasius. Then the clerical relations of Hosius and Eusebius at the Court had their weight; the former prelate venerable and saintly, the latter distinguished

* *Vide Stanley, "Eastern Church," p. 117.*

† 'Αντάρκεις μὲν γὰρ εἶσιν αἱ θγιαὶ καὶ θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν.

RULE OF FAITH.

for moderation and learning. Last, Paphnutius, scarred and mutilated by persecution, and revered alike on account of his sufferings and his ascetic purity.*

The next symbol to the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan was the *Creed of Chalcedon*. Two councils were concerned in its construction, one at Ephesus in 431, and another at Chalcedon in 451. These councils, like the former, were unscriptural in constituency. While episcopal in composition, lay and civil supremacy convoked and controlled them. They were not œcumenical and Catholic, but merely *ex parte* assemblies. Intrigue, insincerity, and injustice were sufficiently exhibited at Nicæa and Constantinople, but the moral character of Ephesus and Chalcedon was atrocious. To call these turbulent and ferocious conclaves Christian is simply ludicrous. It is the language of irony, and not of truth.

The last of the ancient symbols is the misnamed *Athanasian Creed*. Its date and authorship are unknown. It is without even the *show* of authority. It proceeded from no council.† Recent discussion has so completely disposed of its claims, that further observation on its ecclesiastical nullity seems unnecessary.

Such are the origin and history of the so-called Catholic creeds. The first was an artless summary of evangelical truths. The second was an expansion in a more exact form of the first. The third and fourth are still further developments, mainly in the direction of scientific precision.

What is the issue of our inquiry? Simply this. Creeds, catechisms, and confessions, ancient or modern, are valuable only as they reflect the truths of the inspired documents. By the one rule of faith they must be tested. They are without any authority. The so-called national creeds, confessions, and catechisms of Britain, like the imperial symbols of the Eastern Empire, have no authority but that of the civil magistrate. As in the Oriental Church, so amongst us, these instruments recall a history of fraud, hypocrisy, corruption, despotism, and blood.

* *Vide* Stanley, "Eastern Church," p. 180.

† On all the councils and creeds, *vide* Neander, *ut supra*, vol. iv., sub voc.; Gieseler, *do.*, vol. i.; Schaff, vols. i., ii., and iii.; Hagenbach, vol. i.; and Shedd, vol. ii. On the spirit of the councils, *vide* particularly Milman's "Latin Christianity," vol. i., p. 201, *seq.*

RULE OF FAITH.

The patent and obtrusive Erastianism of the Anglican Church makes no disguise of its dependence on secular and lay authorization. Among its fundamental beliefs we find, "General councils may not be gathered together without the *commandment and will of princes*."* "The Queen's Majesty hath the *chief power* in this realm of England, . . . unto whom the *chief government* of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain."† Kings, queens, parliaments, and lay courts of law are the fountain-head and final authority of the national dogma; Church authority there is none.‡

7. *We are opposed to the imposition of creeds, whether so-called national or denominational, because they practically introduce a new rule of faith; they are inimical to the living interpretation of the inspired word, and they compromise and often nullify the supremacy of the Holy Scriptures.*—Articles of faith, standards, confessions, and formularies soon become to Protestants what antiquity, consent, and infallibility are to Romanists.

8. *We resist authoritative and subscribed creeds, however imposed, because they obstruct the progress of the Church in apprehending the inexhaustible riches of Divine teaching in the inspired volume.*—This evil will follow as a natural consequence of exalting the fallible judgments of men above the infallible authority of God. If there be one truth impressed more indelibly than another on the page of ecclesiastical history, it is that the mind of the Church has been only *gradually* penetrated by the Divine ideas of the inspired word. The Gospel took long centuries to root, expand, and mature in the thinkings of men. What right have we to assume that we have excogitated the final expression of Christian doctrine down to the Millennium? Did the men of the past absorb all the evangelical illumination of the Holy Spirit, and are we to look for no more? or is this grace our monopoly, and are we to dogmatize for all generations to come? Not so thought the fathers of modern Congregationalism. Many a noble protest

* Artic. 21, "On the Authority of General Councils."

† Artic. 37.

‡ *Vide* Stanley, "Eastern Church," p. 71.

RULE OF FAITH.

against the finality of human interpretations of the inspired and infallible word might be culled from the letters, counsels, and treatises of John Robinson.

What a calamity it would be if the first notable attempt of the Church to unravel the mystery of salvation through redeeming sufferings were the formal doctrine to which we were bound by subscription! What right have we which past generations had not, to stamp our elucidation as exhaustive and final? It was extensively taught in the early Church, that man was the lawful captive of Satan, to whose seductions he had willingly submitted; and it was represented as unrighteous in God to release man from the thralldom of Satan by force. Our Saviour's agony and cross were hence declared to be a sort of compensation or satisfaction to the Evil One. With slight variations, this rude composition of the grotesque and blasphemous was the orthodox doctrine of centuries. Even Augustine did not transcend this conclusion. So convinced was St. Bernard of the scripturalness of the general belief, that he regarded his contemporary Abelard as deserving to be beaten, and not to be reasoned with, for disputing it. If a soteriological creed had proceeded from the age of St. Bernard, satisfaction to the devil would in all likelihood have been included in a received theory of atonement. What a misery it would be for all the Christian teachers of our own day to be bound to such a human and fallible explanation of a great revealed fact, and to be chained to it by sworn subscription and ecclesiastical authority!

It is one of the most serious indictments of creeds that they leave no room for growth, which is a process demanding rejection and accession. When creeds are made they are commonly living things, but parts die in course of time. Coral animalcules produce two totally different structures. They both secrete inanimate particles, and develop vital substance. One specimen in particular may be described as a column of stone sheathed in a fleshy envelope. Creeds should be classified amongst coralline fabrics. There is very soon an incongruous juxtaposition of the living and the dead. All the parts of creeds are not equally instinct with active belief. What remains alive to the present moment encloses some amount of

RULE OF FAITH.

petrified deposit from the past. Declarative, unauthoritative, unsubscribed creeds, more surely reflect the conviction of the breathing hour, and naturally slough away what contracts and burdens churches embarrassed by subscription and authority. Centuries of anomalies are stratified in the conglomerate of creeds, and convulsion alone can change them. They include no organic provision for renewal.

9. *Creeds are unnecessary to secure unity in Church relationships.*—The religious doctrines which any generation of Christian men may regard as requisite to fellowship can be understood without ecclesiastical instruments, drawn up by authority and enforced by subscription. Signing doctrinal articles constructed by other minds, and, it may be, in the midst of totally different circumstances, cannot, to say the least, reveal with certainty the judgments which a man may hold regarding Christian truth.

A declarative and unsubscribed creed is more certain to present the actual conviction of the person whose opinions you desire to ascertain. When every candidate for ordination prepares his own confession of faith, it must be a very rare thing for a man to compose a deliberate falsehood, and detail what he really does not believe. But a man can adopt creeds as a whole, without accepting definitely any article in particular. If you would know his personal beliefs, you must avoid all allusion to his creed. It provides no clue whatever to his doctrinal opinions. Subscription may mean something or nothing as it happens. In the Anglican Church you learn a man's views, as sceptical, Popish, or evangelical, from private intercourse, or from such public utterances as he may be pleased to make of them. The creed is a blank mask, through which the play of the features does not steal. All swear to the same book. You cannot conjecture the shade of doctrinal belief which any Presbyterian may derive from the standards to which all are pledged. The Presbyterian denomination to which a clergyman belongs is a more reliable indication of his dogmatical standpoint. But that is not certain, and will become less so. We prefer, and especially in a crucial period like our own, the primitive, natural, and direct method of obtaining a man's Christian beliefs from himself, rather than

RULE OF FAITH.

resorting to the circuitous, doubtful, and untrustworthy process of subscription.

10. *Creeds imposed by authority are perfectly useless for the ends for which they are professedly contrived.*—They might as well, and a great deal better, be simply declarative and unsubscribed. They are incompetent to beget doctrinal uniformity, and when unity is violated they cannot restore it. Denominational consistency of belief is avowedly the chief end of subscription, but it has signally failed to procure it.

We used to be told that the Established Church was one, and that Nonconformists were many. The patent fact is that greater uniformity of religious opinion may be found in any single denomination, or in all put together, outside the Episcopal Church than within her own borders. The judgments on the cases of Voysey and Purchas may not lead to any obvious change in the practical situation. Whenever did the "Thirty-nine Articles" beget doctrinal uniformity? Tractarians, Rationalists, and all intermediate types of opinion, and no opinion, exist in the Anglican Establishment, and are likely to continue.

Subscribed creeds which have only denominational and not secular authority have not the efficacy so frequently ascribed to them. Presbyterian standards are much more minute and harmonized in their details, and much more logical and systematic in construction. But no candid person will assert that even these develop a perfect uniformity of theological judgment. Absolute unanimity of dogmatic conviction cannot be predicated of the three chief representatives of Scottish Presbyterianism. All are founded on the same documents. Yet it is notorious that one section, to a considerable extent, embodies high Calvinism; a second evolves moderate Calvinism; and Broad Churchmen are multiplying in a third. Each has what may be called schools within its own borders, and some are openly assailing the standards themselves on points of the gravest import in Christian teaching and ecclesiastical usage. Now, what advantage, to say no more, have abettors of authoritative and subscribed creeds over Congregationalists, who have only declarative and unsubscribed creeds? We have ever preserved scriptural doctrine in the pulpit, and scriptural practice in our churches, equal to those of any denomination in

RULE OF FAITH.

Christendom. We are not likely to reverse our history in time to come.

Creed is as incompetent to constrain uniformity of belief in times of doubt and unsettlement, as they are unable to create unanimity in days of peace. Of what consequence is it that the dominant Church in England is professedly based on the doctrinal opinions to be found in that venerable compilation called the "Book of Common Prayer"? A creed nowadays by a curious *lucus a non lucendo*, not infrequent in ecclesiastical affairs, means, by general consent among those who subscribe such documents, what a man does *not* believe. They have come to be things only to swear by, not to be received or acted on. When a clergyman has pledged his oath to the Prayer Book, he yields his faith and life to it or not, just as he thinks proper. Every one construes the text of the book as he pleases. One finds it Anglo-Catholic, another avows that it is Evangelical. Dean Stanley can manipulate its contents to his satisfaction;* and Mr. Maurice discerns in every part of it, even in the Athanasian Creed, the perfect echoes of his singular and eccentric dogma.†

If creeds fail of their professed design in a Presbyterian Church, it cannot be because the meshes of the theological net are not fine enough to catch the recusant. The Prayer Book was never intended to provide logical toils to arrest the latitudinarian. It was designed to keep all sensitive consciences outside the Church, and to let alone all who were quiet and comfortable within.

Whether creeds are ever used for their professed ends, will always depend on circumstances. One of the most difficult things in the world is to convict a man of departing from his standards, and to eject him from his Church. The most elaborate ecclesiastical machinery, with its authoritative and subscribed creeds, breaks down in the day of trial. In a time of defection, clergymen, for a while, merely remain silent on vital questions, and preach on themes remote from the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel. While that stage of the evil continues, as there is no overt heresy, and no assault on acknowledged truth,

* *Vide* "Essays on Church and State," p. 162.

† *Vide* Contemporary, Oct. 1870.

RULE OF FAITH.

creeds can do nothing. Churches can only feel uneasy, and men may shake their heads, and there will be undertones of suspicion throughout the community. That there are creeds, and ecclesiastical powers to enforce them, will only make reserve, in the earlier periods of theological declension, more unbroken. It may be no very flattering account of human nature, but there is the fact—past and current history being witness—that creeds do not make men more orthodox, but only less honest.

But when heresy arrives at a more pronounced development—what then? Still the creeds will be impotent. Clergymen who have departed from their standards, but yet retain their office and emoluments, will not be speedily convicted and deposed. Men who have hushed up the doubt and difficulty which they had in them, have entered on a course of trifling with truth and conscience. Such a moral training will bear its fruit. There will be for a time as much dubiety in their utterance as in their silence. Men who have subscribed the standards, who have ceased to believe them, who have left off preaching them, will have educated themselves to *evade* the doctrines which they impose.

If error and indifference be widespread in a denomination, creeds do not avail, and nothing will be done. The Moderates, as the Broad Churchmen of the northern Establishment were called by their evangelical contemporaries, had precisely the same confession of our day, but they let one another alone. The power of creeds depends entirely on the strength of the parties in a denomination, and the quality of public opinion outside. In the Episcopal Church, evangelicals will support evangelicals. Ritualists will not censure ritualists, and rationalists will not condemn rationalists. If some obscure clergyman, in quiet times, violate his ordination vows, as the mass will be of one mind, he will be readily disposed of, and be heard about no more. Ecclesiasticism is an admirable thing when exposed to no test, and when there is nothing to be overcome; but the wheels stick fast, and the axles give way, when it has to be drawn over bad roads.

If a notable offender appear in a Presbyterian Church, and if he have supporters in the Presbytery, Synod, or Assembly,

RULE OF FAITH.

and friends out of doors, something may be done to keep up appearances ; but want of courage, the strength of the opposition, and dread of consequences will put the machine out of gear. People commonly fancy it is in troubled periods that the utility of creeds is most eminent. It is in such epochs, above all others, that their insufficiency receives its demonstration.

11. *In troublous times creeds lull Christian people into a false security, and tend to keep them in ignorance of current perils.*—If clergy and churches depart from the truth, let it be patent and unhidden before all men. Antagonism to general belief is sometimes meritorious. So thought the Reformers. But renunciation of creeds is often apostacy from Christ. The great apostle has traced the natural history of turning away from the Lord in very startling and admonitory words to Timothy : “ War a good warfare ; holding faith, and a good conscience ;—which”—which what ?—*which “ good conscience ”*—“ some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck.” If there be “ shipwreck,” let us understand the worst of it. If any depart from the fundamental verities of the Gospel, it is far better for all interests that there be no creeds to veil the mischief. Half the remedy is to know the disease. When there are decays in the religious life, and doubt and disbelief are silently and stealthily working through the churches, it is, on every account, preferable that the malady should be apparent, and not covered. Men retiring from the truth, under any circumstances, have evasive artifices enough without the ecclesiastical cloak of subscription. They will undermine sufficiently in epochs of declension and perplexity, without being driven to burrow in the dark under the frown of authority. When it is the most indispensable to ascertain the religious beliefs of men, creeds are a garb which provides a clerical status, and conceals the religious opinions of the wearer. Subscription does not bind those who need it, and only afflicts those who need it not. Men who are the most reluctant to subscribe are those who require it least ; the most ready to do it confess nothing by their act. If death be preying on the vitals, let us know all about it, that the simple, the poor, and the uncorrupted may call on God for deliverance, and healing, and renewal !

RULE OF FAITH.

12. *The imposition of creeds is to be condemned on account of its immoral effect on the character of the clergy.*—The evil of creeds would be considerably reduced if they simply bound their adherents to the cardinal facts and doctrines of the Gospel. Instead of this, a multitude of ecclesiastical explanations and details are made equally binding on the consciences of the clergy, and are expected to be represented in their ministrations to the people. This is one of the grave mistakes common to all sections of Protestant Christendom. Hence creeds, which are professedly constructed in the interest of unity, have become the most fruitful causes of incurable division. Creeds are producing an immense amount of uneasiness all over Great Britain at the present moment. When the theological atmosphere was calm and untroubled, men received the traditions of their fathers without testing their foundations. In days of unquestioning faith or uninquiring apathy, articles and confessions are accepted as a matter of course. Such are not our times.

The pursuit of truth in epochs of doubt and unsettlement is an arduous duty, especially to young and inexperienced men. It is a terrible aggravation of the natural difficulties of the student to be hampered by details in his creed, which Christians ought to leave open questions. Many a clergyman finds himself in circumstances utterly irreconcilable with transparent veracity and a good conscience. He may hold with grateful faith all fundamental and saving doctrines, and yet be harassed and burdened by particular conclusions, to which he has subscribed, but which he cannot heartily believe. Many good men, under the stress of the manifold perplexities of their situation, wound their moral sensibilities, and lower the tone of their moral judgments. Others, less scrupulous, seem to be positively dishonest. They can accept creeds with ease, and trample upon them afterwards with like facility. Creeds have come to be received with mental reservations, in non-natural senses, and contrary to the original and obvious meaning of their terms. Such unworthy arts are dishonourable in any men, but painful beyond measure in clergymen.

We know that it may be replied, "It is understood that subscription is leniently construed." What a confession is this of the worthlessness of the process! Then, what a history have

clergymen gone through before a Church could have settled down to so humiliating a state of things, and accept it as inevitable!

There can be no doubt that many succeed in deceiving themselves into a kind of belief that they are abiding by their subscription when they have forsaken it. If an Episcopal clergyman substitutes neo-Platonic theosophy for the Gospel, he is sure to find it reflected from the whole teaching of the Church; and if a Presbyterian manifestly retreats from the dogmas of his standards, he can rise up and protest with all the more eager emphasis that he has never wandered from the Confession.

We do not understand men who subscribe with their eyes open to what they never expect to believe. Yet there are such men. Custom blinds them to their guilt; and there are many familiar and ingenious methods of explaining away such prevarication. To our plain, blunt sense it seems that as soon as a man ceases to believe what he is bound by sacred engagement to teach, he ought to resign his office and emoluments. But the vulgar morality of common life, it appears, is not to limit refined ecclesiastics. They are superior to the coarse obligation of oaths and compacts, sealed with obtrusive awfulness before high heaven. Creeds, in our judgment, do not minister to orthodoxy, but to immorality.

13. *There are only moral guarantees of orthodoxy.*—Persons who ascribe a sovereign efficacy to creeds and courts will exclaim, "To what then are we to trust without fixed beliefs and authority to enforce them?" To the only thing to which godly men can trust without disappointment—the Holy Spirit in the ministry and membership of the Churches. The subscribed creeds do not ensure settled religious opinions. The doctrinal permanence which they are supposed to effect is a fiction of the imagination—a mere ecclesiastical superstition. We, with our declarative and unsubscribed creed, have all the guarantees for orthodoxy which exist. If we have the Spirit of God, we shall abide by the Gospel; if we have not the Spirit of God, we shall forsake the Gospel. It is better for the world, the Church, and ourselves that it should be seen, without ecclesiastical disguises, how the matter stands with us.

RULE OF FAITH.

Let not any conclude that our method will leave our creed a shifting quicksand. History is our vindication. We are so convinced that the great evangelical verities lie palpably on the face of the word of God, that we commit the orthodoxy of our creed with confidence, from age to age, to the current and living interpretation of the men who have to work our churches. Authoritative creeds and governing courts are nothing. If the denominations which they represent are faithful to the truth, the creeds and courts are only the accidents of their orthodoxy. The Spirit of Christ alone avails. If we, as Congregationalists, decline in the Divine life, and apostatise from the faith, we thank God that it is impossible for us to stand before men a subscribed and whitewashed falsehood—a tower shedding a baleful light to lure dying souls to plague-stricken and desolate shores. Are any concerned for the ministry, the Church, the world, and their Saviour's honour? Let their solicitude express itself in more earnest prayer for the grace of the Holy Spirit to be diffused abroad, and in more unwavering and reliant faith that their cry cannot be in vain. Humble lips which move in secret to God are more potent than the authority of ecclesiastics, than the arms of conquerors or the might of kings.

14. *We disapprove of creeds because they render a national and catholic faith impossible.*—If there be anything deserving to be called a national and catholic faith, it is the characteristic and common faith of the nation to the extent to which the nation has received the Gospel. The attempt to nationalize a particular form of religion by secular authority has signally failed in Britain. More than half the Christianity of England flourishes outside that phase of it established by the secular power—two-thirds in Scotland, and nearly all in Wales. In Ireland, the endeavour to authorize a mode of religion by secular patronage has been abandoned in despair. If there be a national and catholic faith, it cannot be monopolized by a section of the Church and by a minority of the people. Yet the chief denomination which exists by secular prescription indulges in the presumption and absurdity of vaunting its exclusive nationality and catholicity.

Suppose we question this national and catholic institution,

where shall we find the signs of nationality and catholicity within its own borders? High Church would not ascribe these properties to Low Church and Broad Church, and Low Church would not concede them to Broad Church and High Church. A candid student of history must deny these qualities to all parties, so far as the Episcopal institution can confer them. The Church which excluded the Puritan was not meant to develop the Evangelical, and it was as little designed to supply the extreme Rationalist and Ritualist, which are so sore a perplexity to our ecclesiastical rulers.

The section which affects Catholicism compassionates us for our separation from the ancient creeds which are the heritage of the Church. Which of the Catholic creeds do we not accept with greater uniformity than the fellow-churchmen of our censors? Is it the Athanasian, which the Royal Commission abandoned, against which Dean Stanley has contrived such elaborate indictments, which a noble authority for our national and catholic faith denounced as "the barbarous production of a barbarous age," and which he "never heard read without a feeling of horror," which nevertheless "The Articles" impose? True, Mr. Maurice has come to the rescue. He discovers his own teaching there. Would he not find the like in the Veda and the Koran, in runes and cuneiforms? But Mr. Maurice is quite conscious of his unique idiosyncrasy.*

If by national he meant what enters profoundly into the spiritual and political life of the nation, then we put in our claim as sharing the nationality of England. Are Episcopalians Englishmen? Are they loyal to the throne? Are they Christians? Are they devout students of the word of God?—So are we. Have they traditions which run back into our heroic annals?—So have we. We have written a noble page in our national history. The free religious and civil life of the nation at the present hour we, more than any party, have inspired and moulded. Do Episcopalians demand that the works of the great Englishmen who derived their theological learning from our national universities be considered their peculiar heritage? We repudiate the claim. True, we have been excluded from the venerable halls whence they drew their exact and massive erudition.

* *Vide* "Contemporary," Oct. 1870.

RULE OF FAITH.

But with the men themselves the press has made us familiar. Their folios are not under interdict. We have the chief divines of the Episcopal Church on our shelves from the beginning, and an impartial collection of the best productions of High Churchmen and Broad Churchmen of our own day. What can deprive us of these national and catholic treasures? All that is English and Christian has our warm and grateful appreciation. Their Anglican predilections and weaknesses we can forgive. They are the non-national and non-catholic element which mingles with their godliness, learning, and patriotism.

The national and catholic in a man are the sympathies which pass beyond his own denominational and political circle, and which ally him with the whole life and progress of his Christian compatriots. The most angular, exclusive, sectional, and denominational persons in Britain, as a rule, are Churchmen, and especially the clergy. The Anglican, though in undress, is the most easily recognizable of the clerical species. If our clergy have any peculiarities, they are personal, not denominational—just as with men in ordinary society. We have nothing but ourselves and our circumstances. We grow on our own root, and in ways dictated by the providence of God, rather than by the ecclesiastical conventionality of a body of men. No overpowering wave of denominational sentiment wears us into so many rounded pebbles. From the operation of the same causes we are, as a rule, more eclectic in our ministerial friendships, more catholic in our reading, and more sympathetic towards the religious influence of other bodies. Congregationalists know more of other denominations than other denominations know of them. They are more susceptible to the good which other sects evolve and foster.

What a wonderful talisman is Churchmanship! Its efficacy is little short of miraculous. It is astonishing what conflicting elements it can harmonize. Dr. Pusey, Professor Jowett, and Mr. Ryle move in the magical line of the historical, national, and catholic traditions. Dr. Littledale, Professor Kingsley, and the last Evangelical literate are included in the charmed circle.

A Congregationalist may preach apostolic doctrine, lead an

apostolic life, and achieve apostolic triumphs; but he is a heathen man and a publican. But Episcopalians, though some may be Deists, some Papists, and others what you please, yet all are *Churchmen*. They may call one another anything but Christians, yet they are brethren beloved, united under the mystical spell of three orders of clergy, and are one in reverence for the "Book of *Common Prayer*," which no two parties understand and accept in *common*.

Our ministry may excel in the apostolic art of preaching; our missionaries may evangelize Central Africa, and regenerate the islands of the Southern Seas, and our Malagazy martyrs may emulate the primitive confessors of the Church; but, alas for us, we are without the secular authorization and the episcopal grace which annihilate all perceptible distinction between Archbishop Laud, Dr. Samuel Parr, and John Newton, and reduce to sweetest unison the authors of the "Tracts for the Times," the writers of the "Essays and Reviews," and the "Evangelical" remnant of the Methodist revival.

15. *Absolute uniformity of opinion is a dream not likely to be realized in this world.*—Creeds in general are more Papal in conception than Protestant. They aim, as it seems to us, to construct Churches on minute uniformity of belief, instead of a catholic unity of faith. Identity of opinion is not attained within the limits of the strictest sects in Great Britain. One of the questions which good men will have to ponder in coming days is, what is the unity of belief which Christians should be content to make a term of communion? Is it right to select a particular, and it may be an exaggerated form of doctrine, make it the prominent article of a creed, set it up as a condition of fellowship, and perpetuate, as long as such results can be abiding, a stereotyped sect? Two men, equally under the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit, and equally doing the work of the Master, will part company when the metaphysics of the great change are subjected to the understanding as a purely intellectual problem. The Holy Spirit develops the harmonious processes and results of the regenerate life in both, but He does not effectuate a like intellectual unity. Are these forms of doctrine, in their different modes of expression, to be always embodied in separate communities? The apostolical

Wesley and Whitfield were obliged to shake hands and go into alien sects. Why could not they have existed in communion and fraternity? Must there not have been some wrong idea when such a severance was felt to be necessary? The time had not come for men to bear with one another's inevitable diversities.

The differences of apprehension in which sects take their rise are aggravated by the continued existence of sects. Dissimilarities of judgment are greatly due to psychological configuration, to traditionary biases, to individual history, to modes of conversion, and a variety of determining causes. When sects harden into confirmed types of particular doctrines, and one has its set of controversial defences against another, truth is sacrificed between them, and none of the sobering and healing influences of fraternal intercourse are permitted to guide them to more just and less distorted views of the mind of God.

It is not the least injurious effect of denominational Christianity that no one hardly ever studies truth except under sectarian influence. One cannot long read a book on any religious question without detecting the party bias in connection with which it has been produced. Christian fact and doctrine are seldom seen in the achromatic light of the New Testament. To few minds are they disentangled from sectarian prejudices. There are not many sufficiently catholic in sympathy to welcome to cordial fellowship men whose opinions are not identical with their own. The mass are not prepared to make the basis of communion—in essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, charity. A large number can talk about it, and no more.

Ecclesiastical separations proceeding from insufficient reasons are among the sins and weaknesses of Protestantism. They are traceable to the lingerings of the Papal temper which demands absolute unanimity as the basis of fellowship. It is the old intolerance reduced to absurdity in new and more manifold relations. Protestant hankering after mere ecclesiastical union is only another operation of the Popish spirit. Visible and embodied unity is the only one which many minds either conceive or desire. For our part, we do not expect, while the world lasts, intellectual identity of dogmatic opinion,

RULE OF FAITH.

nor an ecclesiastical fusion of all sects into one. We shall never pray for these things. We do most believingly and ardently anticipate that the time is coming when the whole Church shall recognize that one Shepherd is over all, and that while there may still be more than one "*fold*,"* there will be but one "*flock*."† One human dogma and one human organization are the twin idols of a car beneath which more than flesh has been crushed, and more than blood been spilt. With one thought, one corporation, and one passive and inevitable sentiment, where is there room for the arduous grace of charity, and for a victorious unity in spite of diversity which is to convince the world that the Divine Spirit makes all one? There is no more virtue in the ideal unity of the Romanist and the Anglican than in water descending to its level.

The Holy Spirit of God has a name in the Papal and High Anglican creed, but no function and no operation in the Church. The priest, tradition, and sacraments exclude His presence and supersede His activity. The Holy Ghost is a word only. He is unacknowledged as a real agent in the heart and life of the faithful. The Protestant use or rather abuse of creeds is only a more venial mode of the same unbelief in the indwelling life of God in Christian men. It is amazing how little faith there is in "*the living God*."

We exult to witness the tokens of the presence of the Spirit of all grace, where His activity is so inadequately recognized. It gladdens us to feel the spiritual unity which underlies ecclesiastical separation. It is a great joy to us that High Churchmen, worship our divine and adorable Redeemer, and rest their firm trust in His propitiation for sinners; and we bless God that any wandering souls are catching even imperfect glimpses of our blessed Saviour's glory from afar. The many Churches of the faithful are but one. "*There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.*"‡

* αὐλῆς.

† ποιμνῇ. Vide John x. 16. The English version has obliterated the distinction.

‡ Eph. xiv. 4—6.

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

OF all the splendid and richly endowed institutions of England which excite the admiration and the envy of less fortunate foreigners, none will bear comparison with our ancient Universities. The material aspect is itself impressive: the venerable buildings, the magnificent trees, the spacious and well-kept grounds, the quaint academic costume of the residents, all combine to strike the visitor with the feeling that there is something to which he cannot elsewhere find a parallel. All round him he finds the traces of ease and comfort, reminding him of what he has heard of the noble and, in some cases, princely revenues enjoyed by the several colleges; and the memories with which every one of them is full, memories of the best and the wisest in England's history, show him that these resources have not been wholly wasted; that the old endowments have done an essential and incalculable service to the highest life of the country. But still as he thinks again of what the universities have been, and of what they might have been; as he asks himself what portion of the nation has shared in their advantages, what share of the benefits of progressive thought and legislation has been won by their support and advocacy, what contributions to the literature and science of each generation have proceeded from their precincts, he cannot but feel some touch of shame mingling with all his pride. That an education at Oxford or Cambridge has hitherto been on the whole (though with many important exceptions) the privilege of a class, rather than the heritage of the talent of the nation, that one great section of the community has been almost wholly debarred

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

from it by religious disqualifications, that its character has been such as to furnish few attractions for any but those destined for one or two learned professions, that the literary activity of our wealthy foundations cannot be compared with that of poverty-stricken second-rate German universities,—these are facts which call for very serious consideration, and which serve in no slight measure to moderate the enthusiasm that would otherwise be so readily aroused.

In trying to get at the causes which have hitherto limited the usefulness of the older universities, we shall find that they have arisen in no degree whatever from the original constitution of those bodies. They are due, if not wholly, at least in a very large measure, either to regulations which have been introduced at a comparatively late period in the history of the universities, or else to the gradual change in the character of institutions whose nature and objects at first were very different. Let us consider first the operation of the latter process.

To many, perhaps to most people, the idea of a university is inseparably connected with that of colleges. Going to college and going to the university are for them phrases of identical meaning; and until very recently, in the case of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, they were in reality practically equivalent. Yet not only are the universities of the Continent for the most part entirely destitute of any collegiate institutions, but the university which bids fair soon to stand in many important respects at the head of all the educational institutions of the United Kingdom, the University of London, has no necessary connection with any colleges. And originally they did not form at all a more integral part of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. As Professor Malden justly said in an Essay on the "Origin of Universities," published more than thirty years ago: "The universities existed before a single college was endowed, and the universities would continue to exist with all their rights and privileges unimpaired, even if the property of all the colleges was confiscated, and their buildings were levelled with the ground. If they exercised their proper functions, and performed their proper duties, they might continue to be the instruments of national education."

At first they consisted solely of a connected and organized

body of teachers ; and hence the name, which was in the civil law originally applied to any corporation, whether municipal, ecclesiastical, commercial, or literary. To these centres of the higher education students resorted from all parts, and found for themselves lodgings in the town, as best they could. But they were naturally exposed to exactions of various kinds.* The evil was the greater because the students frequently entered the university at an early age ; and to protect them from these exactions, committees of taxers, consisting each of two citizens and two masters or scholars, were appointed in accordance with a law passed in the fifteenth year of Henry III., to fix the rent to be charged for apartments. Still, in spite of all the rules that could be made, the cost of living would often be beyond the means of the poorer students. How poor some of them were comes out, in a manner which would be amusing if it were not too suggestive, from a clause in the famous Vagrant Act of 1531 (Henry VIII., 22, cap. 12) : "Be it further enacted that scholars of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, that go about begging, *not being authorized under the seal of the said universities, by the commissary, chancellor, or vice-chancellor of the same . . .* shall be punished and ordered in manner and form as is above rehearsed of stray beggars," *i.e.*, whipped through the nearest market-town at the cart's tail, "till their bodies be bloody by reason of such whipping." For the benefit of students of this kind, houses were founded for their gratuitous reception, first by the religious orders, afterwards by the charity of individuals. Over these one or more graduates were placed to preserve order and discipline, and also to give instruction supplemental to that afforded by the public professors and lecturers. The earliest of these colleges is commonly supposed to be University College at Oxford, which, whatever its legendary claims, really dates from the foundation of William of Durham in 1249. At Cambridge the earliest was St. Peter's College, which owes its foundation to the munificence of Hugh de Balsham, Bishop of

* "The townsmen," says Fuller in his History of Cambridge, "began now most unconscionably to raise and rack the rent of their houses wherein the scholars did sojourn. Every low cottage was highly valued. Sad is the condition when learning is the tenant and ignorance is the landlord."

Ely, and dates from the year 1257. Seventy years elapsed before another was added, and the middle of the fourteenth century witnessed the establishment of four more, within a very few years of each other. "But the number of colleges," says Mr. Malden, "in which provision was made by endowment for the pecuniary benefit of their members, was nothing in comparison with the number of *halls* and *inns*, in which the students lived chiefly at their own expense, and which merely furnished cheap and convenient lodging, and the supervision of a respectable tutor or principal, who was responsible to the university for the good conduct of his pupils." This principal was a doctor or master, chosen freely by the scholars themselves; and the institution so flourished, that at the commencement of the reign of Edward II. we find about three hundred halls spoken of by Anthony Wood as existing at Oxford, while the colleges were only three in number. At this time the universities were in a more flourishing state in point of numbers than they have ever been since. Wood tells us that at Oxford alone there were over thirty thousand students; this is pretty certainly apocryphal; but a more trustworthy authority (Major—*Historia de Gestis Scotorum*) tells us that at Cambridge, in his own time, there were four or five thousand. But partly from the establishment of grammar-schools, which date for the most part from the sixteenth century, and which then began to supply a large amount of that rudimentary education which had previously to be sought at the universities, partly in consequence of the invention of printing, whereby private study, to a great extent, was made to take the place of lectures, the number of the students gradually diminished. At the same time the colleges began the practice of throwing open their advantages to others than those on their foundation, but at first only to the sons of nobles and men of wealth, who entered as fellow-commoners, and to the poor students who acted as their servitors. It is not until the reign of Elizabeth that we find the statutes of any college recognizing and providing for the education of the class of students who now constitute the bulk of the undergraduates, the ordinary pensioners, or commoners. But when once the gates of the colleges were thrown open to those who were not actually on the foundation,

their character rapidly changed. The superior tuition that they were able to offer attracted many of those who had previously filled the halls and hostels; and at the same time the license and disorder that crept in among the non-collegiate students, to use a modern term—*chamberdekyns** was the name by which they were known in those days—caused them to be looked upon with great disfavour by the university authorities. Hence it came about that the halls and hostels were by degrees deserted, and at the beginning of the sixteenth century we find at Cambridge only eight inhabited halls. The rest were either desolate, or had been bought up by the religious houses, or by the colleges, which just at this time were rapidly increasing in number. By the time of Elizabeth it had become, if not the express law, at least the universal custom at Cambridge, that every scholar recognized as a member of the university, and attending the professorial lectures, should also be a member of one of the colleges. At Oxford the same regulation was made a matter of express enactment in the statutes given to the university by its Chancellor, Archbishop Laud, in 1636, statutes by which it was governed up to the time of the commission of 1850. No one was allowed to be a candidate for any degree of the university unless his name was on the boards of one of the colleges.

Such, in briefest outline, was the origin of the collegiate system, that until very recently reigned supreme in our ancient universities. We can readily see how the objects with which it was instituted were purely beneficial. They were mainly three: to help the *poorer classes* to the advantages of a university education, to provide the best possible instruction for all their members, and finally to secure the maintenance of proper academical discipline. It furnishes one of the most striking instances that I know of the manner in which the whirligig of time brings round its own revenge, that while the collegiate system has attained the third of its primary objects very incompletely,† it has been the greatest hindrance in the

* A queer corruption of the Latin name for those who lived in lodgings: *Camera degentes*.

† Mr. C. S. Roundell says in his evidence before Lord Salisbury's Committee (Qu. 1490): "Great apprehensions were entertained at the time when that change [the admission of students not attached to any particular

way of the accomplishment of the first and the second. As regards the cost of a university education, it cannot be denied that the necessity of being connected with some one college has occasioned the greater part of the difficulty in the path of a needy student. A variety of causes, too numerous and complicated to enter on *ὡςπερ ἐκ πατέρων*, have combined to bring about this result; but the fact remains unquestionable, that either considerable property, or unusual early advantages, or quite exceptional abilities, have been, till very recently, needed that a student might be able to defray the expenses of a university education. If this is so to a less extent at present, it is only because the poorer classes have at last succeeded in gaining permission to absent themselves from the institutions founded for their especial benefit. At Oxford and at Cambridge students are now allowed to enter the university as undergraduates, to attend the professorial lectures, and to present themselves for the various degree examinations, without incurring the expense of residence in any college. Undoubtedly they sacrifice very much by doing so; the social intercourse on the freest and most equal terms with the flower of England's youth, the perpetual stimulus of friendly rivalry throughout the whole of their undergraduate life, the mental friction produced by association with those of different early training and varying views, and last, by no means least, very much of the *genius loci* and the inspiring memories of the scholars and thinkers of former generations. But do they lose much in the way of direct instruction? Here it is harder to pronounce so definitely. In some of the colleges undoubtedly the lectures are of a very high order of merit; in others they are quite the reverse: and this from two main causes. In the smaller colleges it constantly happens that very great difficulty is found in procuring really competent men to take the work of tuition. The number of the fellows is small, and often the large majority, viewing their

college] was proposed as to the effect upon the morality of the place; these apprehensions, as I have reason to know from recent inquiry, have been entirely discredited. I consider that the element of unattached students is an unmixed good to the university, not only as bringing persons of different classes socially into contact, but also because those who are so admitted are more industrious, and come from more frugal homes."

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

fellowships purely as sinecure prizes, do not reside at the university.* Hence a burden is laid upon those who remain in the service of the college greater than they can well endure. Several subjects are assigned to each, and it may be that in none they are really competent to lecture with advantage. The abler students are quick to see this, and the opinion of the lectures formed by them readily spreads through the rest of the college, and even those who might with profit attend the lectures do not care to do so. In the larger colleges the quality of the tuition given is generally very much better. But here a difficulty not unknown in the smaller colleges presents itself in a yet more formidable shape. At first, as we have seen, the colleges were intended for the help of poorer students, and the pensioners or commoners were but an excrescence on the original foundation. But by degrees they came to be regarded as the most important element, and that college was held to be the most flourishing which could reckon the greatest number of them among its members. A university education has long been regarded (happily for the nation ; whether happily for the university is not such an easy question) as part of the necessary training of a gentleman ; and consequently a very large proportion of the undergraduates have been but dilettante students. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that many of these leave the university with less than the little knowledge which they brought with them from school. The lectures of a college that aim at being popular must be to a large extent adapted to this class of undergraduates. Their attainments and their diligence alike will not allow the lecturers to expect any large amount of knowledge, or to make any large demands upon their industry.† Hence it came about that some few years ago the colleges had almost, if not entirely, lost that very

* By a recent return it appears that at King's College, Cambridge, of fifty-two fellows, forty-two were habitual absentees ; at Queens' College, the proportion was nine out of thirteen ; at Caius College, twenty out of thirty-two ; at Clare College, twelve out of eighteen ; at Oxford the average of absentees seems to be somewhat less, but even there it is fully one-half, with a notable exception in favour of Balliol College. And even of those who are nominally in residence, a considerable proportion are either superannuated or incompetent, or decline to take any active work.

† Mr. Lowe gave some very striking evidence on this point before the late commission. (Demogeot and Montucci, p. 127.)

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

excellence of tuition which mainly contributed at first to secure them their monopoly of education. Students preparing for the severe competition of the mathematical or the classical tripos examination found the college lectures quite inadequate, and the "coaching" of a private tutor, at first a luxury reserved for exceptional cases, became a simple necessity. But when the responsibility of preparation for the great ordeal was transferred from the recognized authorities to independent and freely selected "coaches," the lectures provided by the former naturally came to be regarded first as superfluities, then as encumbrances. The practical irony of such a state of affairs is best exemplified by an instance. At one of the most distinguished and best regulated colleges in Cambridge students reading for classical honours were excused from attending any college lectures for the last twelve months before their degree examination,—I am not aware that they were excused from the payment of the lecture fees,—confessedly on the ground that they would prove of hindrance rather than of service to them. Besides the absurd anomaly of such educational conditions, there was one serious practical evil that resulted; by the private tuition thus rendered compulsory the expenses of a student were increased by from £36 to £60 per annum. When the colleges had done so much to destroy their own *raison d'être*, it was natural that reformers should demand that the road to university distinctions should no longer lie solely through their portals. Hence arose the movement for the admission of students not attached to any particular college. The claim was of course met on the part of the obstructives by a stout resistance. Some poured forth solemn warnings of the danger to the morality and religion of the university; others used very freely the not less potent weapons of sarcasm and ridicule against the class of undergraduates who were likely to be 'unattached.' But both at Oxford and at Cambridge the concession has been made; and if the good results are not as yet all that enthusiasts prophesied,* the evil results, by universal testimony, have altogether failed to appear.

* At Oxford the number of students unattached during the past year has been ninety-eight; at Cambridge, where the new regulations were adopted one year later, there have been twenty-six.

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

Meanwhile the colleges have not failed to attempt as far as possible the work of internal reformation. The two main obstacles in the way of their extended usefulness were, as we have noticed, their needless expensiveness, and the very imperfect adaptation of the instruction given to the needs of the students. Very much has been done in the last few years to assist the more needy undergraduates. Upon the recommendation of the recent University Commission, close fellowships and scholarships have been to a very large extent thrown open to general competition. And if the old law still holds good, that "to him who hath it is given," that those who have had the means to purchase early advantages of training are thereby enabled to secure continued assistance, this is an evil essentially inseparable from the system of award by merit. College authorities can do but little to restrain expenditure, when the greater part of it arises from the tastes and ideas prevalent among the mass of the undergraduates; and the conditions of academic life are necessarily inconsistent with the greatest economy of management. Buildings have to be provided and maintained, and a staff of officials supported for the whole year, when they are required for less than half the time. And it may well be that the qualities which win men fellowships are not precisely those which fit them best for the task of a rigid supervision of finance. Yet on the whole it may be fairly said that the colleges are doing what they can to lessen the necessary cost of residence within their walls. Rooms, for instance, in one of the most popular colleges, where the number of the students is always greatly in excess of the amount of the college accommodation, are let at a rental which only represents two per cent. interest on the cost of erection. Even college cooks, the most unyielding of mortals, second in dignity only (if at all) to the reverend masters, have been compelled to bow before the spirit of reform, to publish tariffs of their charges for the inspection of the authorities, and to furnish an eatable dinner at a reasonable price. The necessary expenses of college life must always be considerable, and as long as the majority of the undergraduate members come from luxurious homes the average expenditure is sure to be high: but even as it is, the amount by which it exceeds the necessary cost of living to a

non-collegiate student is not equivalent to the pecuniary assistance which any one of fair abilities and good education can hope to derive from the college revenues.

With regard to the tuition offered now, the last few years have witnessed a very great improvement. Much of this is doubtless due to the fact that the new regulations affecting the tenure of lectureships have had time to come into full operation. At present a fellow holding any important college office is in several colleges, especially at Cambridge, exempt from the obligation to take holy orders within a given time, which would otherwise be imposed upon him. This naturally tends to extend the choice of lecturers, and to give to those appointed a greater and more permanent interest in their work. Education is coming to be regarded in its true light, as a profession distinct in itself and independent, not needing to be combined with any other to make it honourable. And the increasing frequency of the appointment of married lecturers tends in the same direction. Very much yet remains to be done here: MM. Demogeot and Montucci, in their admirable and most interesting report to the French Minister of Public Instruction, "*De l'enseignement supérieur en Angleterre et en Ecosse*," justly dwell at length upon the evil arising from the fact that "*le tutorat n'est point une carrière*." How this difficulty can be got over I shall venture to suggest further on. At present we need only notice what has been done. The younger tutors are certainly devoting themselves, if not with more energy, at least with much more special adaptation to the needs of the students; and endeavouring, in some cases with marked success, to do away with the need for private tuition, which taxes so severely the pockets of the poorer undergraduates. But perhaps the most important and fruitful reform is the establishment of "*inter-collegiate*" lectures. Till recently there was great danger that a tutor or lecturer, especially at the smaller colleges, would be compelled to grow like Margites: *πόλλ' ἠπίστατο ἔργα κακῶς δ' ἠπίστατο πάντα*. But at Cambridge a scheme has been in full operation for the last two years which promises to be of equal service to students and to lecturers. Eight or ten of the most distinguished classical tutors at different colleges have agreed to confine

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

themselves for the most part to special departments of Greek and Latin literature, to which their individual taste or acquirements may direct them. One, for instance, will always choose the subject of his lectures from the works of the Attic dramatists, another from the writers of silver Latinity, a third from the poets of the Augustan age, while a fourth will devote himself principally to philology. The advantage to the lecturers is evident: each is enabled to acquire a thorough familiarity with a limited field of study, and to make himself a recognized master in it. But the students do not profit less: those who are placed by their college authorities under any one of these allied lecturers, have the privilege of choosing freely which course of lectures they shall attend, and their requirements must be very exceptional if they do not find precisely what they are needing. At Oxford, I believe, there is even a wider power of choice allowed to undergraduates, and many of the best courses of lectures are freely opened, not only by the university professors, but also by the college tutors, to all who choose to attend them, at a very moderate charge. At the same time we have had other extensions of the educational advantages of the universities of hardly less importance. New professorships and lectureships have been founded for giving instruction in physical, in moral, in natural, in legal, and in historical science. Those who only know the Cambridge or Oxford of some years back would find at present a revolution effected, none the less complete because it has been so silent. It is not too much to say that a student now at one of the least favoured of colleges enjoys far greater opportunities of wide and varied culture than he could have obtained at that time in the wealthiest and most liberal. Whatever the value of the education to which Dissenters were first admitted some fifteen years ago, the universities, in which they have at last won a long-denied equality, offer them now far richer advantages. And if very much remains to be done in the way of extending and popularizing these advantages, we have every reason to hope that the influx of a new and vigorous element into the governing body will accelerate the progress of reform.

But now let us pass to the second main cause which has so long robbed an important section of the English people of their

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

rightful heritage. In the earlier stages of the history of our old universities there was virtually nothing like a religious test imposed upon their members. In a voluntary association of teachers and learners such a thing would have been manifestly and absurdly out of place. We find, indeed, early instances of visitation of the universities by the authority of the archbishop of the province or the Crown, for the purpose of suppressing Wycliffism and Lollardism.* But this was only a natural outcome of the supervision which it was then considered the duty of rulers to exercise over the religion of the people wherever they might be congregated. The universities suffered under no special religious restrictions. The first instance that we find of anything like a subscription test appears in the year 1534, when all members of colleges were required to make a declaration that none of them would call the Bishop of Rome by the name of Pope and Supreme Pontiff, and that they would only designate him as Bishop of Rome, and Bishop of the Roman Church, in any sermon whether public or private; and that they would not pray for him either as Pope or Bishop of Rome. Any fellows, scholars, and chaplains who refused to subscribe to this declaration were deprived at once of their offices and emoluments. But this was only an individual instance; we find no attempt made to raise it into a system; and the Royal Commission of 1549, though endowed with extraordinary and absolute powers of reorganizing the University of Oxford, and exercising their powers freely enough in endeavouring to purge the university from the taint of Romanism, do not appear to have established any universal and necessary test. The reactionary policy of Gardiner and Pole was happily only allowed to prevail for a time; but the fatal consequences that would have followed from it were plainly foreboded by the rapid decline of the university in numbers and in learning. "Very few degrees were taken at Oxford in Queen Mary's reign: the readers in the schools were hardly able to go through a lecture; scarcely one sermon in a month was delivered in the city; and an acquaintance with the Greek language was seldom

* See Wood's "Annals of the University of Oxford," under the years 1397, 1411, 1476, 1518.

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

professed, either in public or in private, by any student."* Affairs were not much altered for the better in the early part of the reign of Elizabeth; the repeated changes in the university regulations had inflicted injury which was not readily repaired, and the diminished numbers of students were not soon recruited. But in the year 1570 (by an Act of Parliament, 13 Eliz., cap. 29) the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge received new charters of incorporation, fundamentally the same as those which regulate them still, and a better order of things was introduced. The year 1562 had witnessed the adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion (ratified in 1571); but as yet subscription was only required from those who were actually in holy orders, and the portals of the universities were open to all comers; the only instance of religious exclusiveness was the ordinance which compelled all students to attend at the daily reading of the Anglican liturgy. The first definite enactment which made the universities for nearly three centuries the exclusive property of a section of the nation, was contained in letters from the Earl of Leicester, then Chancellor of Oxford, to the resident authorities.† After complaining that many Papists still lurked among the members of the university, he directed "that no scholar be admitted into any college or hall in the University of Oxford, unless he first, before the Vice-Chancellor, subscribe to the Articles of Religion agreed upon, take the oath of the Queen's Majesty's supremacy, swear to observe the statutes of the university, and have his name registered in the matriculation-book." This and several similar decrees that were issued by Leicester in the course of the next few years were directed mainly against the Romanists, and the Puritan party were but little molested, a natural result from the political

* Heywood : Oxford Commission, etc.

† Cambridge during this period remains somewhat in the background. The singular absence of extreme partisanship which has always distinguished her, as compared with Oxford, stood her in good stead now. While Leicester was endeavouring to do a work which Laud, with fatal success, undertook to undo afterwards, the Chancellors of Cambridge, though men of not less distinction and position, were not filled with the same party zeal; and the university is happy enough to have but little history during this period. (See "Huber's English Universities," vol. ii., pp. 39—42.)

position of the Chancellor. His immediate successors endeavoured to enforce the strictest observance of these regulations, but with only limited success. The Puritan element in Oxford was still very strong, and in 1616 James I. sent royal directions to the Vice-Chancellor and the heads of houses, with the purpose of suppressing it. By these, among other provisions, it was ordained that all who take any degree in the schools should subscribe to the three articles of the 36th canon. To say nothing of the rigid and intolerable nature of the subscription thus required, it is evident from the very title of this canon—"Subscription required of such as are to be made Ministers"—that it was an extraordinary act of despotic power on the part of our "British Solomon" to impose this test upon all graduates of the university. Three years before, in 1613, subscription to the three articles was enforced at Cambridge, by a decree of the Senate in obedience to royal letters, upon all candidates for degrees in the higher faculties; and in 1616 an autograph letter of the King enjoined that the same subscription should be made before proceeding to any degree in any faculty. We have no trace of any definite submission to this injunction on the part of the university, but we find that the rule was practically enforced from that time forward. The chains were finally and for more than two centuries indissolubly riveted upon Oxford by the Laudian statutes of 1636. The pedantic bigot, whom we have to thank more than any other man for the incalculable loss that the nation has suffered from the exclusiveness of Oxford, had been for more than thirty years a resident member of the university (1590—1621), before he was raised to the position of its Chancellor. He had been a warm adherent of one of the two great parties that at Oxford, as through the length and breadth of the land, were now commencing their mortal conflict, and when he found himself in favour and supported by the royal authority, he set himself to crush or to banish all his opponents. By the statutes which he imposed on the university, boys matriculating below the age of twelve were indeed exempt from any religious test, but between the age of twelve and sixteen they were required to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, and if above sixteen years of age

additional oaths were required of them. Every degree in the university was protected by a renewed subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles and the three articles of the 36th canon. These statutes were enacted during the period of the unrestricted tyranny of the Court, of the Star Chamber, and of the High Commission, and did not receive the confirmation of the Legislature. On the contrary, during the first session of the Long Parliament the House of Commons replied to a petition from the Puritan party at Oxford by an order of the House, declaring that the subscription "ought not to be pressed or imposed upon any student or graduate whatsoever in the University of Oxford, it being against the law and liberty of the subject." Unfortunately, the dominant party in Parliament showed themselves very reluctant to allow to others the freedom of conscience that they claimed for themselves. In 1647, in spite of the protracted resistance of the universities, supported (to their honour be it said) by the bulk of the Independents, the Solemn League and Covenant was forced upon all their members, and the Directory substituted for the Liturgy. We need not dwell upon the many changes and attempts at change that were made during the troubled period of the Commonwealth. None of them left any permanent effect upon the universities, and they are of interest to us mainly as showing the profound and enlightened interest that was taken in the higher national education by the leading members of the Puritan party.* Upon the return of Charles II. he issued a declaration (dated Whitehall, October, 1660), which contained a clause providing that no persons in the universities should be hindered in the taking of their degrees from the want of a subscription to the three articles of the 36th canon. Two years had not elapsed before the Act of Uniformity received the royal sanction, and an "unfeigned assent and consent to and approbation of the

* One regulation was contemplated by a parliamentary committee of 1649, which still remains as one of the prime objects of university reformers: "That lest men should degenerate, and make their means their end, and through retirement become drones, no man should enjoy his fellowship beyond doctor's standing, or one year after his commencement [as a doctor], unless they be such as are professors or public lecturers."

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer" were required as a condition of the tenure of any university or college office. The Laudian statutes were restored in their full severity at Oxford, and the doors of the universities were barred for nearly two centuries by a rigid religious test.

I have found no instance of any serious attempt to remove the disqualifications thus produced, until the famous petition of 1772, directed against subscription to the Articles. The only result of that petition was an outspoken debate in the House of Commons, in which Lord George Germaine declared that it appeared to him a melancholy thought, and indeed a crying grievance, that his son at sixteen must subscribe upon entering the university what he himself could not understand, much less explain to him, at sixty. No change took place in the tests imposed at Oxford, but at Cambridge the subscription to the three articles of the 36th canon was exchanged for a declaration of *bona fide* membership of the Church of England as by law established. The first petition for the complete abolition of religious tests was presented to Parliament in 1834, from sixty-two resident members of the Senate of the University of Cambridge; and in the same year Mr. G. W. Wood, the member for South Lancashire, brought in a bill to give Dissenters the right of admission to Oxford, from which they were entirely excluded, and of proceeding to degrees at either of the old universities. The bill was warmly supported by the late Earl of Derby, and carried by large majorities through the House of Commons, but thrown out by the Lords. An attempt made in the next year by the heads of houses at Oxford, supported by the Chancellor, the Duke of Wellington, to exchange the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles required at matriculation for a simple declaration of Church membership, was wrecked on that most fatal reef in the way of all true progress, the conservatism of the non-resident graduates. Repeated attempts were made during the next few years either to abolish the tests altogether, or to have the whole condition of the universities investigated by a Royal Commission, but many hindrances intervened to delay all action, until in 1850 the Oxford Commission was at last appointed. It was met by

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

a protest on the part of many of the heads of houses against any interference with their vested rights of managing the colleges at their own good pleasure; but it succeeded in collecting much valuable information, and presented a report which still is full of interest. Acting on this report, Lord John Russell introduced, in 1854, the Oxford University Reform Bill. This did not at first propose to deal with the question of the admission of Dissenters, owing to a division in the Cabinet on the subject, though Lord John Russell admitted that he could not think the whole purposes of the University fulfilled, while there was a test at the entrance of the University which hindered so many persons from entering it at all. But in committee Mr. James Heywood moved the addition of a clause, rendering it unnecessary for a person upon matriculation to make or subscribe any declaration, or to take any oath, save the oath of allegiance. Mr. Henley declared that the clause would lead to complete heathenism; Mr. Roundell Palmer maintained that the Church was at stake, and that if the university were open to Dissenters, it would be made unfit for all, or at least unfit for the Established Church; and Lord J. Russell suggested that as the Dissenters had waited so long already, they might as well wait a few years longer. But in spite of all this, and against the Government influence, the clause was added by a majority of ninety-one. Mr. Heywood's second clause, however, throwing degrees open as well, was rejected; though the bachelor's degree was conceded. The discussion in the Upper House produced no important change, and the bill became law. Meanwhile, in 1852, a similar Commission had been entrusted with the duty of reporting on the University of Cambridge, its colleges, statutes, and studies. A bill founded on this report was introduced into the House of Lords in 1855, but was ultimately withdrawn, from the state of public business at the time, and reintroduced next year in the House of Commons. The only point of interest for our present purpose is that an amendment of Mr. Heywood's, giving to Dissenters the right of admission to the Senate, was passed by the Commons, but rejected by the Lords, and not insisted on; and another amendment, proposed by the same stout champion of equality, providing that stu-

dents conscientiously objecting should be exempt from compulsory attendance at chapel, was at once rejected. There reform was stayed for years, but it was not long before the assertion of the equal right of all to the national endowments was again put forward in Parliament. In 1864 Mr. Dodson's bill to abolish the tests required for the Oxford M.A. was lost in the first stage, and Mr. Bouverie's bill to throw open the fellowships was lost on the second reading. Mr. Goschen's bill of 1865 was read a second time, but then withdrawn. The next year saw a similar fate befall the bills of Mr. Coleridge and Mr. Bouverie, after being read a second time by large majorities. In 1867 Mr. Coleridge's bill was carried through the House of Commons, and rejected by the Lords. In 1868 the progress of the bill after it had passed the second reading was stopped by the pressure of other business. In 1869 it was again rejected by the House of Lords, and in 1870—when for the first time made a Government measure—it was shelved by the appointment of a select committee. The events of the present year are too fresh in the recollection of all to need any recapitulation. The one irrefragable argument against the university tests was their utter failure to effect the object with which they were instituted; they admitted all whose influence was likely to be harmful, for such men were not conscientious enough to decline them; they excluded only those who, in the very act of refusing subscription, gave evidence of an honesty and a sincerity which were sufficient guarantees of the healthful influence of their example. In the face of this Lord Salisbury devised a test that was pre-eminently well adapted to fret and hamper tender consciences, without imposing the least restraint on men of less sensitive honour. The absurdity was too great for even his friends in the House of Commons, and the inept attempt to mar the completeness of the freedom at last attained met with the signal failure that it merited. The reasons put forward by the Lower House for disagreeing with the amendments of the Lords furnished an adequate statement of the voice of public opinion; and the Lords gave way. Henceforth in the universities, as in every other gathering of English citizens, the truth in every branch of human thought will be left to win its way to the hearts of

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

men, unaided by any extraneous support. And the wisest among us are those who are least disposed to fear for the results. The noble words are still as true as ever: "Well knows he who uses to consider that our faith and knowledge thrives by exercise, as well as our limbs and complexion. Truth is compared in Scripture to a streaming fountain: if her waters flow not in a perpetual progression, they sicken into a muddy pool of conformity and tradition. . . . And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple: who ever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter? Her confuting is the best and surest suppressing." And may we not follow with the glorious vision? "Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks: methinks I see her as an eagle, mewing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full mid-day beam; purging and unscaling her long abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance, while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she means, and in their envious gabble would prognosticate a year of sects and schisms."

And now that we have traced the steps by which religious equality has been established in the National Universities, let us consider what we may expect to be the results of the complete triumph of this principle: first, as regards the Universities themselves; and secondly, as regards the Free Churches of the country. The general effect upon the universities claims our first attention; because upon the extent to which these are modified depends in no slight measure the value of the privileges that are now secured.

Up to the present time the government of the universities has been in a strangely anomalous position. The power of deciding upon all matters of importance rests ultimately with the General Assembly (at Oxford, the Congregation; at Cambridge, the Senate) of graduates, who have proceeded to the degree of M.A., or the corresponding degree in some other faculty than that of arts. All who are thus qualified, whether

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

resident at the universities or not, have a right to vote upon any measure that is brought before the General Assembly in the form of a "grace" approved by the Council. Now the ordinary routine of business is left very much in the hands of the residents; that is, as a rule, the most distinguished of the graduates, who have been elected to fellowships and lectureships at the various colleges, or who are living in the town as private tutors, and for the sake of independent study. With this body there is, on the whole, but little fault to find: the air of the cloister has rarely been found very favourable to breadth or freedom of thought; and the condition of holy orders, still unhappily imposed (in the majority of cases) upon any continued tenure of a fellowship, necessarily compels a large proportion of its members to come to the consideration of any question with preconceived opinions. Yet on the whole the resident members of both the two great universities cannot fairly be charged with any failure to see the needs of the times, or any undue opposition to reform. They are, for the most part, actually engaged in the work of tuition; and so are able to understand the changes that are required as the field of knowledge expands. But their efforts are being constantly thwarted by the action of the great body of non-residents. The degree of M.A. at Cambridge and Oxford represents no further test of requirements, no higher education than the ordinary B.A.; nothing but an additional payment, usually amounting to about forty pounds. It consequently happens that many of those who go to the university for the sake of education rather than the social and professional distinction which attaches to a degree, fail to qualify themselves, by what they feel to be an idle and meaningless form, for a share in the government. But the clergy find the higher degree useful for professional purposes, and hence they constitute a very large proportion of the governing body. They live in very many instances away from the current of the higher thought of the country; and the practical duties of their calling furnish them with scanty opportunities, and leave them little leisure to make themselves familiar with the problems of the higher education of the time. They interfere but little with the ordinary affairs of the university; but whenever any question of importance

arises their influence is at once felt. They form a trusty phalanx, rallying at the well-worn cry, "The Church is in danger!" and flocking to the Senate-house or the Sheldonian in overpowering numbers to vote unanimously "placet" or "non-placet" at the bidding of the Tory whip. One or two of the most recent instances of the working of this pressure from without may be noted here. It is, of course, now a matter of notoriety that it was purely the dead-weight of the country clergy that drove Mr. Gladstone from Oxford: the analysis of the poll showed with a most suggestive force that he was the chosen representative of a great majority of the residents and the graduates in honours. Again, when Sir W. Heathcote's seat was vacant, it was nothing but this immovable mass of ecclesiastical prejudice that deprived the university of the honour of a worthy representative of all that is best in her scholarship as well as her churchmanship, in the person of Sir Roundell Palmer. At Cambridge, recently, a syndicate, including all the most distinguished classical scholars of the university, had drawn up a scheme for extending the course of study required for the classical tripos. Their proposals met with the all but unanimous approval of those who were actually engaged in tuition; but they were not fortunate enough to meet the views of one or two of the leading Conservatives. The final decision was postponed to the meeting of the Senate, which happened to fall on the day of the annual flower-show: the clergy of the fens came up in hundreds to enjoy the union of a little gentle dissipation with the extinction of a measure of progress; and the scheme that had been matured by the protracted labours of Regius Professors and Lecturers of Trinity and St. John's, was thrown out by the votes of men who had probably not opened a Latin or Greek book since the distant days when they just managed not to be plucked for the poll. The principal objection to the changes was that they would have encouraged the study of comparative philology, and, on the principle of "*Omne ignotum pro terribili*," this was supposed to be mysteriously connected with the equally unknown horrors of German neology and rationalism.

Let us take another not less striking instance of the way in

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

which the present governing body fails to represent the real workers of the university. Last session, when the bill that has now happily become law was made for the first time a Government measure, three petitions upon the subject were sent up to Parliament from Cambridge. One, very numerous signed, was in favour of the bill without any qualifications; the second asked for the insertion of some securities for the maintenance of religious worship in the colleges, to which few Nonconformists would object; the third, expressing the opinions of a small minority of the resident fellows and lecturers, prayed for the retention of the tests. And yet, in the face of this very plain manifestation of the wishes of those directly concerned in university tuition, when it was proposed to affix the university seal to a petition against the Solicitor-General's bill, the proposal was carried without opposition. It was felt by the Liberal party that a vote taken under conditions which allowed the real opinion of the university to be swamped by a mass of non-resident voters, in many cases unqualified to form a judgment on the questions at issue, would be worse than useless; it would be absolutely misleading. And hence a motion appeared to express the unanimous opinion of the university, which was distinctly opposed to the previous action of the majority of its resident members. All university reformers are living in hope of the abolition of a privilege which is productive of nothing but harm to the cause of progress. But until this consummation, so devoutly to be wished, is attained, the only chance for those who desire to adapt the universities to the altered needs of the times lies in the prospect of the growth of a body of Nonconformist graduates, who may form as trustworthy a phalanx on the side of progress and reform as the country clergy now supply to the ranks of a stubborn Conservatism. It cannot be denied that the Liberal party owes its superiority in the English boroughs solely to the support of the Nonconformists. There is probably hardly a town in the kingdom where the return of a Conservative would not be rendered certain, I will not say by the support, but by the neutrality of the various Dissenting bodies. It has often been a matter of reproach to the national universities that their members have

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

been found, with hardly an exception, voting against every one of those great measures of reform to which our country confessedly owes its present peace and prosperity. The reproach is just, but it would have fallen equally upon any other electoral body from which an Act of Parliament excluded all the Non-conformist constituents. Now that this glaring anomaly has been removed, and submission to a theological test is no longer required as a condition of voting for a representative in the national Parliament, we may fairly expect to see Oxford and Cambridge rising to the level of other educated constituencies.

But this is not a matter of supreme importance. The Liberal party has been strong enough in the past to do without the votes of the university representatives, and it would probably be strong enough to dispense with their aid, if need be, in the time to come. The national will, which has given us Catholic Emancipation, Parliamentary Reform, Free Trade, Religious Equality in Ireland, and the Abolition of Tests in Corporations, in Parliament, and finally in the Universities, all in the teeth of the unwavering opposition of Oxford and Cambridge, will set itself to the tasks which yet await it, without very much caring whether the Senate and the Congregation are blessing or banning. It is a matter of much greater moment that the party of reform should be strengthened within the universities. Very much yet remains to be done there, and it is well that, if it be possible, the needful action should originate from within. We have heard quite enough of late of the evil of State interference with the internal management of the universities and the colleges: it is often simply unavoidable that if those who have the knowledge have no will to move, others, who have the will, should take imperative action, even with imperfect and inadequate knowledge. Yet it does not admit of doubt that reforms imposed from without, by the authority of Parliament, are in danger of being less adapted to the needs of the case than such as are suggested and accepted by free internal action. Hence we may look upon the increase of the number of Dissenting graduates that is sure to follow the abolition of tests as of essential service to the universities, by enabling them to effect reforms for themselves, which otherwise would have to be

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

thrust upon them by a far less competent authority. Two of them we may dwell upon as examples, of the kind of changes which have long been desired by reformers, but hitherto desired ineffectually. The first concerns the question of the college services. At present, in the great majority of instances, attendance in the college chapel is a matter of compulsion. The number of attendances required varies with the various colleges; in some, the undergraduates are expected to be present only some two or three times in the week; in others, a daily attendance either in the morning or else in the evening is required, and any irregularity is punished by messages of censure, by reprimand, or by "gating." At Trinity College, Cambridge, a peculiarly ingenious device is resorted to for securing, on the part of the scholars, the due performance of their religious duties. Part of the emoluments of a scholarship consists in exemption from payment for the dinner in hall; but if any scholar has failed to present himself at least eight times during the week at the college chapel this exemption is not allowed him; and he is, for that week, placed on the footing of the ordinary pensioners. A singular method truly of securing spiritual worship, by making it the means of earning a dinner! The evils of compulsory attendance are surely far too plain and palpable to make it worth our while to dwell upon them. The very notions of compulsion, and of Christian worship, are so utterly incongruous that we cannot think of their union without repugnance; and how those who are familiar with its effects can still defend the system which requires it, is a standing matter of marvel. But it is worth while to notice in passing one feature which does not lie on the surface. The relaxation of the rule requiring daily attendance is so far from being a relief that it is a positive aggravation of the mischief. If an undergraduate knows that he is required to present himself in chapel every day at a certain hour, he may feel the regulation to be irksome, but compliance with it will come to be regarded in time as a daily duty; and the habit of regularity will do away with much of the feeling of constraint. But if a certain weekly number of attendances be enforced, there will always be the sense of a tale of "chapels" to be made up, and neglect at

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

the beginning of the week will involve a scramble towards the end to avoid the punishment of deficiency. No one in residence can fail to be struck with the very marked difference between the numbers in the college chapel on Monday or Tuesday, and the numbers on Friday and Saturday, and the deduction is easily drawn. One or two colleges have already abolished compulsory attendance; and it is evident that the presence of even a few Dissenters on the governing bodies is all that is wanted to seal the doom of an institution so foreign to all the ideas of the age.

Two questions, however, must be carefully kept apart, which are often, I fear wilfully, confused by the opponents of religious equality. Whether daily prayers in the college chapels should still be retained is one thing; whether all undergraduates, whatever their beliefs, should be compelled to attend them is quite another. The latter practice the whole of the Liberal party, State-churchmen and free-churchmen alike, earnestly protest against, not only as opposed to all their profoundest beliefs upon spiritual worship, but also because of the practical evils that are found to be inseparable from it. But with hardly less unanimity, if I know anything of their feelings, they would deplore the discontinuance of the daily services of the Church of England. To very many Nonconformists the morning and evening prayers are little, if at all, less dear than they are to the members of the Established Church. They have risen above the petty objections of the Savoy Conference—of course I am not speaking of the occasional services,—and they find in the English Liturgy, rich with the prayers of all the centuries of Christendom, and fragrant with the memories of the thousands of holy men who have uttered in its words their longings, their hopes, and their grateful praises, very much for which they know not where to look for a substitute. If it be expedient, as it most assuredly is, that all who are living together within the same walls, teachers and learners alike, should join in common worship, they know of no form of worship at once so simple, and so catholic, so highly valued by those to whom it is familiar, and so generally accepted by the various sections of Christians, as the daily service of the Book of Common Prayer. They would gladly see greater liberty of

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

using it allowed. Some abbreviation, especially in the prayers for Sunday morning, would be very welcome; and they are not likely to join even apparently in the recitation of that union of the obscurest metaphysics, and the most unchristian dogmatism of the darkest times of the dark ages, falsely called the Creed of Athanasius. But that the chapels of Magdalen and Merton, of King's and St. John's, should cease to echo to the psalms and the prayers of daily worship, would be a consummation not more devoutly regretted by the thirty-nine-times-articled clerks, than by those who up to this time have been excluded as unworthy members of ancient and religious foundations. And many would go yet further. Participation in the highest rite of Christian worship, the feast of thanksgiving, of communion, of self-dedication, is now restricted to those who have the passport of the imposition of episcopal hands in confirmation. We have seen, indeed, by a noble defiance of the rubrics, a company of godly men of different sects, and varying creeds, commencing a work for the honour of Christ and the service of His Church, by uniting in the celebration of His ordinance. But however much we may admire the genial, catholic, and truly Christian spirit which prompted that celebration, we must not forget that it was, in the judgment of most, in deliberate contravention of the Church's regulations. I suppose that Independents rarely if ever gather themselves together for this sacred service without inviting any members of other Christian churches who may be present to join in the Communion with their common Lord. In some at least of the Cambridge colleges, if a Nonconforming student wishes to join his fellow-students in this solemn rite, he is repelled by the authorities, until he has consented to forsake the faith of his fathers, and to be admitted by confirmation into the ranks of the Established Church. They are probably justified in their action by a strict interpretation of the rubrics; but can we suppose that such an unchristian practice of exclusion will long survive in the presence of the free and friendly intercourse that will result from the abolition of religious tests? I think that we may be very sure that it will not long survive the fast-approaching disestablishment, which will place the Anglican

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

community in its proper position as a church among sister-churches. And I venture to look forward to the time when in the early morning hours, at the simple and quiet Communion Service, or at the bright and festal midday Eucharist, with its pealing organ and white-robed worshippers, the students in our colleges shall gather together, freed from the fetters of sect or party, and from every test save that of deep-felt need of common adoration of their Lord and Saviour.

But the college chapels are not solely places for worship; they are also places for religious instruction and edification. How can this be properly supplied under the changed order of things? Well, let us first see how it is supplied at present. In one of the largest Cambridge colleges, numbering generally about four hundred resident members, the provision for religious instruction consisted in some twenty sermons in the course of the year, preached in the college chapel on Sunday evenings. The preachers were the senior fellows of the college, taken in rotation, and included representatives of the various parties in the Church. Hence of course the sermons were delivered from the most different stand-points. The bewildered undergraduates were taught on one occasion that their primary duty was absolute submission to the authority of the Church, and that the privilege of the layman was to listen and obey; on another, that now was the priceless opportunity for engaging in a free and unbiassed quest of truth, for reading widely and reading on every side, sure that the Spirit of truth would in His own good time lead the honest searcher into all truth. One Sunday the verbal and literal inspiration of the Bible was dwelt upon with a rigour that would have gladdened the heart of Dr. Baylee. The next, the preacher presented his hearers with a *catena* of authorities allowing the widest freedom of interpretation of the Jewish history and literature. Mr. Maurice, Mr. Darwin, and the Bishop of Natal were made the subjects alternately of the bitterest denunciation and at least implicitly of fearless eulogy. And all that the undergraduates could learn with clearness from the dissonant jangle was that the strongest liberal opinions were not inconsistent with the profoundest learning, the richest culture, and the largest-hearted charity and goodness. At last the scandal

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

grew too great to be longer tolerable ; and about four years ago the sermons in the college chapel were discontinued. From that time to the date of my latest information, no single attempt has been made by the college authorities to give any words of advice, of warning, or of encouragement, to the hundreds of students who are placed beneath their care. It is in the presence of facts like this that Mr. Gathorne Hardy grows eloquent upon the importance of preserving the religious character of university education ! A rigid system of tests applied by the university, tests applied by the college, and tests applied by the Bishop at ordination, has had this one result : that a body of Anglican clergymen find their differences so deep and so far-reaching that they cannot consent to lay them aside even to join in a common work. It is deliberately held to be better that a body of young men, in the most impressible period of life and surrounded with unwonted temptations, should be suffered to go without one word of help or guidance, rather than that they should be allowed to see the irreconcilable differences of opinion among their appointed teachers. Whatever be the results of some admixture of Dissenters with the governing body, they cannot be worse than this. We shall at least have a frank acknowledgment of the varying phases of religious faith, instead of an idle, I had almost written a dishonest, attempt to cloak them under the mask of a fictitious uniformity. But may we not hope for something better ? Is it not at least conceivable that when the compulsory character of the college service is done away with, room may be found for the operation of a wider and more catholic spirit ? If in any particular college the body of fellows includes a Baptist, a Romanist, or a Presbyterian, I, for my own part, should be glad to see the college chapel made use of for his ministrations to all who cared to come and listen to him. I would not have it claimed on the one hand as a right, but rather asked on the other as a favour ; and I believe that the experience of many of our Nonconformist colleges would show that the good results of such catholic liberality would not be small.

So far then from sharing in the fears that have been so freely expressed, that the abolition of tests involves the abolition.

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

of the college services, I have the fullest confidence that in the majority of instances it will greatly tend to their increased influence, meaning, and efficiency.

There is another question to which the attention of university reformers has been earnestly directed of late, and in which very much assistance may be fairly expected from the addition of Liberal members to the governing body; I refer to the proper application of the college endowments.

When we consider the present condition of Oxford and Cambridge, we meet at once with the strange phenomenon of colleges enjoying large benefactions, bequeathed for the express purpose of making education accessible to all, and giving an education unequalled in expensiveness, from which the majority of the community are therefore entirely excluded. We have had of late schemes of reform passed and carried for allowing poorer students, as a very great boon, to dispense with those institutions which were founded entirely for their benefit. This is due, in a very large measure, to causes which are out of the reach of the college authorities; foremost among them is the style of living which is rendered almost necessary by the social exigencies of places which are the resort of the wealthier classes. But a very great deal is owing to the extent to which the revenues of the colleges are applied to supplying the prizes of education, and not to rendering education accessible. It is impossible to state with accuracy the collective income of the colleges; a knowledge of the internal affairs of each is strictly confined to the members of the governing body;* but a tolerably correct approximation may be made. At Cambridge there are altogether 360 fellowships, at Oxford close upon 400. Mr. Paley, in an admirable pamphlet, recently published, on the question of religious tests, estimates the average income at not less than £300 a year. But, even if we include the allowances made for rooms and commons to the residents, this is probably quite too high. We shall be nearer the mark if we assume the average value to be £250 per annum; but, even on this lower estimate, if we

* Mr. Gladstone's answer on July 17th to a question addressed to him by Lord E. Fitzmaurice encourages us to hope that this will not long continue to be the case.

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

add in the revenues of the heads of houses, we shall have as the total amount divided by the colleges among their graduate members an annual income of at least a quarter of a million. And this, it must be remembered, is given away entirely in the form of sinecure prizes. No duties, except the most formal and trifling, are required from any one on the ground of his tenure of a fellowship. To every office which is held by a fellow involving any real work—whether tutorship, lectureship, bursarship, or stewardship—an additional salary is attached, derived either from the ordinary college revenues or from the fees of students. It is often urged, and with some justice, that these additional salaries, though amply sufficient for the duties for which they are paid, would not be sufficient of themselves to retain good men in residence to discharge them. We may therefore exclude from our consideration for the present those who are actually engaged in the proper work of the university. But at least one-half of those who are drawing an income from the college revenues do not even reside within the college walls; and of those who are in residence a considerable proportion have either no duties at all, or such as are merely nominal. I should be speaking strictly within bounds if I were to say that, in the case of the great majority of the minor offices, all that is now done by three distinct officials could, without any undue pressure, be assigned to one. We may fairly assume, then, that at least £150,000 per annum is distributed purely in the way of prizes among the most distinguished of the university graduates. With regard to the method of allotment of these very valuable and numerous prizes, I may say at once that it is above suspicion. Some inequality is produced at Cambridge by the fact that the colleges give a very decided preference in the election of their fellows to the members of their own body, so that in the smaller colleges a graduate of comparatively little distinction often secures an honour for which he would have had little chance had the competition been more extensive. But, on the whole, though instances of hardship to individuals are sometimes to be met with, it may be said that the best men are elected to fellowships without any prejudice or favouritism. The root of the evil is reached when we consider, not the method of election, but the conditions of

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

tenure. These vary in every college, and sometimes within the limits of the same college. But, as a general rule, they are two in number—celibacy, and ordination within a given number of years. It is easy to see how these should have originated. At a time when the colleges were really monasteries of a certain kind, when residence within their walls was almost imperative upon every member, and when literature and science were pursued by few outside the clerical order, both these conditions were natural, we may even say necessary. Now they are certainly neither the one nor the other. With regard to the first provision, that at marriage all claim upon the college endowment ceases at once, it is evident that its immediate operation is to prevent the most distinguished graduates, as a rule, from devoting themselves to education as the work of their life. Few men—at any rate, at the age at which fellowships are usually won—will resign themselves to the thought of a life of perpetual celibacy. The instances in which a college lectureship is given to a married man, though happily on the increase, are still too rare to make it possible to count upon such a piece of fortune, and the work of a private tutor, or “coach,” is very exhausting, and his position and income insecure. In the majority of instances one of two results must follow; either a man must leave the university to prepare himself for the practice of some profession which may furnish him with a permanent livelihood, or he must remain in residence with the consciousness that the university cannot be his life-long home; so that if he devotes himself to acquiring and imparting knowledge he must renounce for ever all hopes of marriage. The necessary result is, as an acute French observer has noticed, “that those who hold the office of tutor do not keep it long enough, and only regard it as a temporary occupation, to which marriage will soon put an end.” No one can fail to see the difference that there is likely to be between work that is thus taken up *ad interim* and work which is chosen deliberately as the occupation of a lifetime. But, further than this, there is an evil of not less magnitude, which might escape the notice of an outsider, but which no one familiar with the working of the system can overlook. The vast amount of money devoted to sinecure fellowships is

often justified as affording leisure for original work in literature or science. But the arbitrary limitations of the tenure of the fellowships here exert a most injurious influence. A man whose income is secured to him for life will naturally remain contented with a very much smaller sum per annum than one who knows that the greater part of it will cease at a given time. The younger fellows, who know that their consciences will debar them from retaining their emoluments by seeking ordination, and who think it at least within the bounds of possibility that irresistible attractions may make them little inclined to fulfil the condition of celibacy, naturally devote their energies to the accumulation of money rather than learning. I do not know anything which affects more painfully those who value aright the latent possibilities of powerful intellects than to see young men of the highest promise provided for abundantly, as far as immediate wants are concerned, by college endowments, and yet consuming all their time and energies in one dreary and monotonous round of elementary teaching, in order to be able to lay up a wise provision for the future. It is, of course, impossible to give instances; but those who are familiar with either of our older universities will have no difficulty in calling to their remembrance the names of men from whom the highest achievements in literature or science might have been reasonably expected, but who have been seized upon at the beginning of their career by the malignant demon of "coaching," and when their course at the university is closed, they are found to have left behind them a reputation for a handsome balance at their banker's, and not one single important contribution to the sum of human knowledge. The cause of education suffers in two ways. If we compare Oxford or Cambridge with one of the German universities, we find, in the first place, that the cost of private tuition (as distinguished from college or university lectures) is at least four times as great, and that though the need for it is much more widely felt, owing to the keen spirit of competition; and, secondly, that the published works bearing on higher education will bear no sort of comparison. At both our English universities it is true that there are scholars who are raised by their circumstances or their inclinations above the temptations before which

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

many fall, and who give us priceless results of their disinterested labours. Works like Munro's "*Lucretius*," Burn's "*Rome and the Campagna*," and Jowett's "*Plato*," if they do not entirely redeem the character of the universities, show that English scholarship is unsurpassed. But if the quality of the work is unimpeachable, it leaves very much to be desired in point of quantity, before the nation can consider that it has an adequate return for the immense expenditure of its resources.

And if these are the results of the uncertain tenure of fellowships among those who remain in residence, in the case of those who leave the university to prepare themselves for some other profession than that of education, the results at least to the colleges are hardly less to be regretted. To the individuals who prefer to throw themselves into the battle of the world, instead of remaining in what may readily become the careless ease of the cloister, the choice is not likely to bring anything but ultimate good. But the colleges, by holding out little or no inducement to men to devote themselves to study and tuition as their life-work, of necessity lose the services of all the most active and energetic of their number, excepting only such as find it possible to give full play to their activity and energy within the limits of holy orders.

But on the other hand, we must remember that if on the one side the conditions of the tenure of fellowships are injuriously rigid, on the other side they are equally faulty in the direction of laxity. It is a very great evil that in the vast majority of instances, unless a man is willing to abstain from marriage, and to take upon him the orders of the Church of England, he is precluded from taking part, at least for any length of time, in the higher education of the nation. But it is an evil of no less magnitude, that if he is willing to conform to these two qualifications, there is no limit whatever to his tenure of a fellowship. No duties of any kind are attached to it, not even that of residence within the walls of the college. The results of this will be seen best by an instance, which is but a specimen of what is often found to occur. Thirty-seven years ago a student in one of the Cambridge colleges took a degree, which showed by no means unusual intellectual ability. He was not qualified to share in the educational work of his

college, but owing to a limitation in the number of candidates he was elected to a fellowship, and that fellowship, by taking orders within the required period, and remaining unmarried, he still retains. Without taking into any consideration the additions which would be made by interest, the amount in actual cash received by this fortunate individual from the college revenues cannot be less than from £12,000 to £14,000. And if we ask what claim he has had to draw such a sum from what is really national property, the only answer that can be given is that seven-and-thirty years ago he succeeded in solving a certain very moderate number of mathematical problems. No services of any kind rendered to the college, educational, disciplinary, or administrative, not even the favour of his presence within her walls; simply and solely the memory of a mediocre amount of ability showed in 1834. In the presence of facts like these, Mr. Gladstone alleges as a reason for maintaining (in a bill that professes to restore religious equality to the universities) the antiquated clerical fellowships, that the requirement of holy orders acts as a check upon the tenure of sinecure incomes. Facts have abundantly showed what was surely plain enough *à priori*, that those whose consciences will allow them to draw money in return for which they discharge no duties, will not often hesitate to take upon themselves any vows or professions that may be required for the continuance of the sinecure. I do not say that fellowships given purely as prizes are without their value; on the contrary, I believe them to be on the whole, though not without drawbacks, very beneficial. In an admirable pamphlet recently published, Mr. W. R. Kennedy, an advanced reformer, argues with great force in favour of some non-resident fellowships. He has been dwelling upon some of the evils connected with the system which have just been discussed, and continues as follows:—

“There are, I know, some who will say ‘why do you stop here? You have admitted that education is the primary object of these endowments, and that it is necessarily impaired by the system of non-resident fellowships; why not then sweep away the abuse altogether, and abolish non-resident fellowships?’

“Because I am convinced that such a measure would inflict

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

an injury on the nation far outweighing any possible gain to the university. The fellowships of the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge have been to the professional classes in England, during the last fifty years, not the least important among the means by which they have been able to hold their own against rank and riches; and any one who knows what a part in politics these classes have played during this period knows that the influence thus gained has been of great and lasting service to the country, by preserving to some extent the political balance between intellect and culture on the one hand, and wealth and territorial influence on the other.

“But apart from the political advantage of the non-resident fellowships, they exercise a most healthful influence upon the social character of the nation. By the prospect of honourable reward which is thus held out to able men as a just recompense for foregoing the advantage of starting five or six years earlier in their professional career, intending barristers, solicitors, physicians, and clergymen are sent by their parents, often at the cost of severe self-sacrifice, to Oxford or Cambridge, where, as well from university society as from university studies, they acquire a many-sidedness of thought and breadth of culture which are not possessed by the same professions in any other European country. From our familiar enjoyment of them we are apt to overlook the great and manifest blessings which flow from this source into every nook and corner of English society. But we need not in truth look far for an example. Take the case of the clergy of the Church of England. To what do they owe their indubitably higher position as compared with the ministers of other religious bodies? Not to their wealth, for they are too often of the poorest; not to their zeal nor to their virtue, for Nonconformist ministers are not less zealous or less moral: it is due to the university education which the bulk of them have received. This Nonconformists themselves know, and have often acknowledged it both in and out of Parliament; and this it is that in no small degree contributes to their laudable anxiety for the repeal of those hateful disabilities which ought ere now to have been taken away. It may be objected that the professional classes would in any case seek the advantage

of university education, and that it cannot be the prospect of a fellowship which draws them, because all who deserve or who need fellowships do not in fact obtain them. This is no doubt partially true, but it should be remembered that a very large proportion of such men do get them now, and I believe that a still larger proportion would under such a scheme as I have proposed; and above all, there can be no doubt that very many struggle to get to the university in the hope of this ultimate reward, who certainly would not, if all chances of obtaining it were taken away, unless they were willing to spend their lives in university work. But it is precisely this poorer hard-working set which makes up the pith and marrow of Cambridge as a place of education."

This is just and forcible reasoning in favour of *some* prize fellowships; but it is not sufficient, as indeed it is not intended, to defend the magnitude of the sinecure prizes that are now awarded. It is well that a diligent student should be rewarded by such pecuniary assistance as shall ensure him leisure for further study, or a fair start in one of the learned professions. It is not well, assuredly, that he should receive an annuity tenable as long as he chooses to comply with certain simple though it may be irksome conditions. It has been ascertained that the average tenure of a fellowship is about ten years; and some of the smaller Cambridge colleges, which give their fellows the choice between the ordinary terms of tenure and an absolutely unconditional enjoyment of their income for a given number of years, have adopted this number as that which fairly represents the average chances. But most will, I think, be prepared to admit that a ten years' tenure is too valuable a prize to be given away purely as a reward for past distinction. Every object which is gained by non-resident fellowships would be equally attained by limiting the period for which they might be held to seven years. But suppose a rule is adopted that no non-resident fellowship, and no fellowship the occupant of which is not discharging the duties of some college office, shall be tenable for more than seven years. If we assume that of the quarter of a million which I have taken as the aggregate annual value of all the fellowships, £150,000 go to the class which would be affected by such

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

a regulation, an estimate probably much below the mark, the adoption of such a rule would save a sum not much less than £50,000 per annum. Of course, if the regulation were allowed to stand just as I have suggested, the only result would be that the vacancies in fellowships would be more numerous by one-half than they are at present, and three men would obtain them where only two do at present. But this is not an object to be desired. At Cambridge, and still more at Oxford, the supply of fellowships is fully equal to the numbers of those well qualified to hold them, and any great increase in the number of annual vacancies would only lead to an undue lowering of the standard expected to be reached. But if the average tenure of fellowships were diminished by a third, it is evident that one-third of the total number of fellowships might be alienated without altering the number of annual vacancies; and thus the saving effected might be put into a shape that would enable it to be easily dealt with. But again, this amount might be readily doubled without in any way impairing the real value of the fellowship system, by enacting that no fellowship should be suffered to exceed £200 per annum in value. This sum would be amply sufficient to meet all the legitimate requirements of such as were preparing for the learned professions, and also (especially when combined with free board and lodging) the permanent wants of those that were in residence. If the reduction involved the loss of a little of the luxury that now is common in the colleges, it would not have to be greatly regretted on that account. And thus from the £250,000 a year that have been taken as our basis (a sum which Mr. Kennedy, by the way, considers decidedly too low), £100,000 could be spared in this way with the greatest ease for other requirements.

It is almost needless to remark, in passing, that the fellowships thus reduced should be tenable without any kind of restriction as to celibacy or holy orders. If they are to be regarded simply as prizes, they ought to be clogged with no unnecessary conditions which impair the value of the prize. If a man chooses to marry on £200 a year, or has other resources which make his income up to a more satisfactory amount, it cannot be said either that he deserves his prize the

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

less, or that he is thereby of necessity unfitted for doing good service in literature or in science. And on the other hand, theology is a branch of study which has such powerful attractions for a certain class of minds, that we need not suppose it necessary to promote it by any such artificial encouragements. Falling back upon the fundamental principle of jurisprudence—that every restriction upon liberty is in itself an evil,—we may claim that the abbreviated tenure of the reduced fellowships should not be subjected to any conditions whatever beyond those of ordinary decency and morality.

But the boldness of university reformers is not contented with the annual income of £100,000, which the proposed alterations would render available for other purposes. They point to the well-paid sinecures held by the heads of houses, and they ask why the ample revenues offered by these should not be utilized for the common advantage. The functions discharged by the nominal heads of the colleges are almost entirely of a purely formal character, and such as might, without any inconvenience, be transferred to another member of the collegiate body, either the senior fellow in residence, or one of the tutors specially elected. I do not for a moment doubt the expedience, or indeed the necessity, of having some one definite head of a college; it would be impossible to over-estimate the debt which some of the younger colleges throughout the country owe to their principals. But such a head could well be elected from among the other fellows, and his influence over the undergraduates would be greatly increased by his taking an active part in the teaching and discipline; his power for good is simply crippled by the wealthy and otiose *securitas* of his position. And if any are inclined to think that the valuable sinecures afforded by the headships are of use as furnishing retiring pensions to those who in their younger days have served the college well and faithfully, I would remark, in the first place, that they do not always, by any means, fall to these; and secondly, that if they did, the number of them is far too small to answer this purpose at all effectively. The same object might be secured very much better, and at a far less cost, by some uniform system of retiring allowances. It is not possible to estimate exactly the portion of the college revenues that is absorbed by the

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

heads; the college accounts, as the French commissioners justly say, are shrouded in the closest veil from all but the members of the governing body; one of the most distinguished members of the University of Oxford declared before the Royal Commission that he could not even estimate their aggregate income within £50,000.* Mr. Mark Pattison estimates the average income of an Oxford head at £1,200; the Mastership of Trinity College, Cambridge, is commonly considered to be worth at least £5,000, and that of St. John's £3,000 a year. We should probably be below the mark in estimating their collective annual value at £50,000. Adding this to the amount that we have obtained already, we get a grand total of at least £150,000 a year; and yet not one of the changes that I have suggested would impair in the least degree the real value of the universities.

The question follows, how this enormous income could be utilized to promote the efficiency of education. Let us look at the main educational needs at present. We have on the one hand a body of college lecturers, of the highest ability, and frequently of the greatest energy and devotion to their work, but compelled by the conditions on which their posts are held to regard them of necessity as temporary occupations. The prizes open to these are few and far between, and are often clogged with requirements with which they are little inclined to comply. With respect to these, the object to be aimed at is clear and definite. To return to the expression already quoted from MM. Demogeot and Montucci, a tutorship is no career;† one of the primary desires of the university

* Demogeot and Montucci, p. 43.

† Their words are of sufficient importance to be quoted at length: "Le tutorat n'est point une carrière. Nul enseignement spécial et pédagogique n'y prépare, nulle espérance d'avancement n'y soutient le jeune maître. Qu'il réussisse bien ou mal, son avenir n'en est aucunement modifié. S'il n'est pas dans les ordres, il n'a point de pension de retraite à attendre; s'il est d'Eglise, et la plupart sont dans ce cas, la prébende attendue lui arrive infailliblement, par ordre d'ancienneté, quelque soit le mérite ou la nullité de ses services. A-t-il du goût pour l'enseignement, il voit les chaires de professeurs publics peu nombreuses, peu lucratives, et souvent fermées pour lui par les modes imparfaits d'élection. Il cherche et il découvre bientôt à Eton, à Harrow, à Rugby, et dans d'autres écoles, une perspective plus séduisante, et il s'empresse d'abandonner les fonctions de tuteur à un successeur plus jeune et plus inexpérimenté."

reformers should be to make it such. On the other hand, we find an increasing number of students, but a supply of instruction quite inadequate of itself to their requirements, and necessitating a serious drain upon their resources in order to supplement it by private assistance.* Is it possible to meet at once both these crying needs? I think so, and by a simple plan, which is not indeed even a new one, but simply a bold and thorough extension of one which has been tried already with the happiest results. Let us suppose that the colleges were compelled to pay over annually to some board, syndicate, or commission, that portion of their income which we have seen could well be spared, after all the encouragement really desirable had been bestowed on successful students. Let us suppose this board holding in trust one out of every three fellowships as they become vacant under the new rule of tenure, receiving all the surplus college income after each fellow had taken the suggested maximum dividend, and as each sinecure headship fell in, receiving in addition the portion of the college revenues that had been assigned to the maintenance of this office. In no long time their income would amount, as we have seen, to at least £150,000 a year. With this they would be able to establish by degrees, in each of the two older universities, a hundred additional posts—call them professorships, tutorships, lectureships, or by whatever name you will. These could be endowed with £750 a year apiece, and should be tenable without any restriction whatever as to celibacy, orders, or religion. A higher sum might of course be fixed if it were thought desirable; but when we consider the numerous advantages which the tenants of such posts would enjoy, the leisure for study, the independent position, the long vacations, and so on, the figure mentioned will probably seem to be sufficient. The immense advantages that would follow at once from such a reform are apparent. We should have, in the first place, that which we are most desirous of obtaining, something to which men of the highest university distinction could

* The late Dean of Ely estimated the annual cost of private tuition to undergraduates at £50,000; I cannot but think this estimate much too high, yet even exaggeration has its limits, and the fact that such a sum could be named, points to a vast expenditure.

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

look forward to as a life-provision, if they were willing to devote themselves to education. Tutorships would become a career, for in the case of each there would be a goal in sight, to which they would eagerly press. The college lecturers would be chosen, as at present, from the most distinguished of the younger graduates: but these, instead of looking always outside the university for their permanent work and settled home, would be aiming always to win such a reputation for scholarship, vigour, and success in teaching, as might secure them in due time one of these university appointments. In Germany we have something of the kind; the prizes, it is true, are far less brilliant, but the energy with which the *privat-docent* works his way through an extraordinary professorship to a post on the regular staff, the wisdom with which he chooses some special subject, or branch of a subject, in which he may win a distinguished name, the literary activity that is engendered by the stimulus of honourable rivalry, may give us some idea of the benefits that such appointments confer on the younger graduates. The university professor or lecturer would in his turn feel the advantage of the change. Compelled by the conditions of the tenure of his office to devote himself especially to some one subject, he would have every opportunity to acquire the right of speaking on that with the authority of a master. He would have at the same time adequate leisure for the accumulation of knowledge, and just that practical experience in teaching which seems to be needful that knowledge may be given out in the clearest and most helpful form. We might fairly hope that the scholarship of the English universities would be more deep and varied, and their productive power more rich and fruitful, than has ever been known before. Nor would the advantage to the students be at all less marked. The vast increase in teaching power would allow of a very much greater subdivision of labour. Not only would every teacher be able to confine himself within a narrow range of subjects, but also the number of students put under his care would be much less. The university lecturers would do the work that is now done by the college officials, but very much more effectively; and the latter would be free to assume a more natural position, and devote them-

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

selves rather to the special assistance of individuals. The incubus of private "coaching" would be, in a very large measure, done away with; the permanent endowments of the tutors would admit of an almost nominal scale of fees; and the universities, with all their richest educational advantages, would be open at last to all but the very poorest of the people.

This plan in its details is of course only the suggestion of one individual, though it has received the approval of not a few competent judges. But in its general outline it may be said to represent the programme of the Liberal party in the older universities. The abolition of sinecures, the diminution of the rewards that are given for past distinctions, the extension of the system of permanent university appointments, as opposed to temporary college posts, these may be said to be the points towards which university reform will endeavour to make its progress. Something has been done already in this direction. At Oxford, fellowships have in several instances been grouped together and appropriated to the endowment of a professorship; and to this reform, stoutly resisted at the time of its institution, the university owes the services of a Conington, a Maine, and a Rolleston.* Cambridge has followed unbidden in the same good ways: the new professorship of physical science has been established virtually by the contributions of the colleges; and Trinity College has devoted an annual sum equal to two of its fellowships to the maintenance of a prelectorship in physiology, held by a Nonconformist. Every step in this direction is just pure gain to the educational efficiency of the university. It is to be hoped that the university reformers, strengthened, as they undoubtedly will be, by the operation of the law for abolishing tests, will not hold their hands until a scheme, if not identical with that here proposed, at least not inferior to it in magnitude and thoroughness, is actually brought into effect.

We cannot doubt then that the effect upon the universities of the admission of Dissenters to the governing body will be a great impetus to reform in many ways. But what will be the advantages to those who are thus admitted? One result at any

* Had not two of the wealthiest of the colleges found means to elude hitherto the operation of the Oxford University Reform Act of 1854, six other professorships would have been added to the number.

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

rate is not likely to happen, which opponents of their admission have constantly predicted. They have allowed that it is not probable that Dissenters should ever form a majority of resident graduates, and so secure the general direction of university and college affairs. Many of them perhaps would be willing to admit, that if ever the greater number of the educated men of the country should be Nonconformists, it would be reasonable that national institutions should be conducted on Nonconformist principles. But this is not what they fear. They are rather afraid lest the various sects should each make a set at some particular college, with the view of securing to themselves in time the majority of votes in its governing body, and then transferring it practically into an institution devoted to their own sectarian tenets. We have been told again and again that Romanists, Independents, or Unitarians will send all their promising students to some one college, will thus secure the fellowships in it for their own religious body, and will finally break the university up into an aggregation of sectarian colleges. It is not needful to dwell upon the practical difficulties that would attend upon the attempt; they might undoubtedly be overcome if there were any desire to bring about such a result. But it shows the most surprising ignorance of their opponents' principles on the part of the Conservative party, that they should be able to conceive the existence of this desire. They must have utterly misunderstood the whole meaning and object of the agitation for the removal of religious tests, if they do not see that the result which they fear would be dreaded far more by its supporters than by themselves. Very much of the energy which the Liberal party have shown in pressing the measure forward is due to their conviction that a man's religious opinions have nothing whatever to do with his fitness for teaching literature or science. Something is due to their sense of the injustice done to the Nonconformist graduates who have been deprived of the just recognition of their attainments.*

* The Rev. E. H. Perowne, in his evidence given before Lord Salisbury's committee, informs us that he only knows of *three* such cases. [Ans. 540 in the First Report.] The extent of this gentleman's acquaintance with the affairs of the university of which he is a resident member, and the care which he had taken to qualify himself for giving evidence before a committee of the legislature, may be estimated from the following list :—

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

But among the Dissenters a stronger and deeper feeling has been at work. They have the keenest sense of the injury that is done their sons by confining them in a close and narrow sectarian atmosphere for their education. They know that if a conscientious adherence to their own convictions is to be toned down and mellowed by a far-reaching sympathy, an extended knowledge of the world, an enlightened liberality; if vigour and firmness are to be allied with "sweetness and light," this is only to be attained by free and friendly intercourse in the time of youth with those of differing and even opposite opinions. Hence it is that the number of lay students at New College, Regent's Park, or Spring Hill, has always been very small, while unsectarian institutions, like University College, London, and still more strikingly, Owens College, Manchester, have grown most rapidly. In contending that all the prizes of Oxford and Cambridge should be open to their children, they have not been fighting for any mere theory of religious equality, justly as they value this. Their main desire has been that all the youth of the country, irrespective of creed or persuasion, should be equally attracted to the national universities, and should there learn, in friendly intercourse with each other,

H. M. Bompas, Scholar of St. John's College, Fifth Wrangler, 1858.

J. Stirling, Scholar of Trinity College, Senior Wrangler, First Smith's Prizeman, 1860.

W. S. Aldis, Scholar of Trinity College, Senior Wrangler, First Smith's Prizeman, 1861.

J. B. G. Moore, Scholar of Peterhouse, Fourth Wrangler, 1863.

J. A. Aldis, Scholar of Trinity College, Sixth Wrangler, 1863.

N. Goodman, Scholar of Peterhouse, Senior in Natural Sciences Tripos, 1865.

T. S. Aldis, Scholar of Trinity College, Second Wrangler, and Smith's Prizeman, 1866.

T. N. Toller, Scholar of Christ's College, Seventh Wrangler, 1866.

T. G. Osborn, Scholar of Trinity Hall, Tenth Wrangler, 1866.

A. S. Wilkins, Scholar of St. John's College, Fifth Classic, 1868, University Members' Prizeman, 1867 and 1868, Hulsean Prizeman, 1868, Burney Prizeman, 1870.

E. Armitage, Trinity College, Second in Moral Sciences Tripos, 1868.

N. E. Hartog, Scholar of Trinity College, Senior Wrangler, and Second Smith's Prizeman, 1869.

A. S. West, of Trinity College, Senior in Moral Sciences Tripos, 1869.

To which are now to be added:—

John Hopkinson, Scholar of Trinity College, Senior Wrangler, and First Smith's Prizeman, 1871.

W. M. Spence, Scholar of Pembroke College, Third Wrangler, 1871.

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

lessons far transcending in value any that professor or tutor could give them. A proposal like that of Canon Liddon, to assign some colleges entirely to the leading bodies of Dissenters, not only offends against a principle which they cling to very tenaciously; if executed, it would strike at the very root of the union and interfusion at which they are aiming. There is no fear whatever that the system of denominational colleges should ever be formally adopted at Oxford or Cambridge. And, if Nonconformists are wise, there will be as little risk of any virtual adoption of it. In several instances already some such specializing tendency among Churchmen of various views has been at work, but always with very disastrous results. A college, from the influence of some particular tutor, has gained a reputation as the favourite home of a certain class of doctrinal opinions, and parents who held these opinions have therefore sent their sons to it. For a time the college has risen to unusual prosperity, but in aiming to secure the support and the confidence of a class it has sacrificed the good opinion of the majority. The attractive tutor leaves, and the favour that he had won for his college is rapidly transferred to another. But the evil arising from the class character that he had given it is not so easily removed; deserted by those who had once supported it, and not yet taken back into favour by those whose confidence it had forfeited, it has to struggle on for years in comparative obscurity. Among the many various causes which lead to the singular variations in the numbers of students, especially at the colleges of Cambridge, I am persuaded that few have had more effect than this tendency to a sectarian tone of thought among the various authorities. And similar evil results to a yet more serious extent would be sure to arise if any attempt were made to give to any of the colleges under the new regime a like special character. I do not believe that the danger of such a result is great, but Dissenters will do well to guard against the very possibility of it.

This naturally brings us to an allied subject, on which it may not be out of place to add a few words of caution here. It is not purely, or even mainly, because of the instruction given at our older universities that they are unrivalled as places of higher

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

education. The curriculum of the London University is wider, its examinations much more testing, and the value of its ordinary degree much higher as an evidence of acquirements, than is the case at Oxford or at Cambridge. And the lectures at its allied colleges can often well afford to stand a comparison with those of their older rivals. This is indeed but natural, seeing that the professors are generally selected from the most distinguished Cambridge and Oxford lecturers. Those who have had the privilege of listening to Professors Malden, Seeley, De Morgan, Roscoe, or Jevons, have little reason to complain, as as far as the acquisition of knowledge goes, of any disadvantage. If a higher standard of scholarship is attained elsewhere, it is due to the conflux of the best-trained students of the country, attracted by the splendid prizes that are offered, and spurred on by a competition of unrivalled intensity. And yet to those who have had experience of both, London will hardly rise above the *justa noverca* ; it is Cambridge or Oxford that will ever be the *alma mater* ; a result that is due to influences quite other than those of direct tuition. Wherever many young Englishmen are gathered together within the same walls, the freedom and vigour of their social life will break out into a hundred forms of activity, each lending its passing charm to the day, and graving itself ineffaceably on memory's brightest tablets. We need not join in the prevalent worship of muscle, and regard it as the greatest triumph of liberal principles that a Nonconformist should be stroke to the university boat, or President of the University Athletic Club. And yet we may remember that the differences between Dissenters and Churchmen are often considered as mainly social. In one of our leading Liberal newspapers I find the following sentences : " Undoubtedly the line between the Established Church and Dissent is generally coincident with a certain line of social demarcation. Everywhere, to belong to a Dissenting body is to be marked with a badge of social inferiority. As a man rises to a higher stratum, the tendency to Dissent drops off imperceptibly with the tendency to misplace his *h's*." We should not have been surprised to hear these words from a country clergyman, who usually regards a Dissenter somewhat as the squire looks upon the poacher, as a

kind of unreasonable and almost unnatural phenomenon. But to find such language in a paper written by gentlemen for gentlemen, shows us clearly the extent of the work that has to be done by the free social intercourse of the universities. We may justly honour the distinguished men who have again and again, in recent years, won the highest honours of the university in almost every branch of study, and have shown that the greatest intellectual ability is not inconsistent with a firm adhesion to unpopular principles. But after all it is not perhaps too much to say that this has been the least part of the good that has followed the partial and incomplete admission of Nonconformists. We may hope that there are not many bigoted and ignorant enough to believe that Baptist or Unitarian opinions necessarily denote an incapacity for the highest attainments in science, in literature, or even in theology. The irritating claim of social superiority—somewhat belied, be it noticed in passing, by its frequent reiteration, for a gentleman is not usually distinguished by his contemptuous refusal of the title to others—is not to be refuted by merely winning senior wranglerships, or university prizes. And of late years we have had a constant though a limited supply of Nonconformist students who have failed to reach any very high distinctions, but who in the cricket field, in the college boats, at the Union, and in general society have maintained, unblemished, their character as English gentlemen. Less known, it may well be, in denominational circles, and furnishing no themes for stirring leading articles or applauded allusions in platform speeches, than their highly-gifted fellows, they have well supported them in breaking down the walls of caste exclusiveness. And both classes will require to be strengthened. We shall need a succession of well-trained able Nonconformists to maintain the traditions of honour connected with the triposes and the university prizes, and to win the fellowships from which their predecessors have been debarred. But we shall need at least as much students who, with less ability or inferior training, may join the others in maintaining the character of Nonconformists for diligence, integrity, manliness, and courtesy. It surely will not take very long to carry to the minds even of the incipient country clergy, the conviction

that a man may differ from the doctrine of the Established Church, may disapprove of its polity, and may deny *in toto* its claims on his allegiance, and yet be an educated Christian gentleman. A personal reminiscence may perhaps be allowed me here. I was walking back one evening from a debate at the Union with a college friend, the son of a country rector. The subject for discussion had been one which turned upon the principles of Nonconformity, and several of the Dissenting undergraduates had taken the occasion to state their views; perhaps the statement came with the greater weight because the audience knew that the opinions were held with a strength of conviction which would carry the speakers through the sacrifice of all the most splendid rewards that the university had to offer them. Be this as it may, my friend turned suddenly to me, and said, "Why, when I was at home I was always taught that Dissenters were wicked people, who wouldn't go to church on Sundays; but I see that you have really something to say for yourselves." And now that he has taken to his father's profession, I have no doubt that wherever it be his lot to labour he will enter on his work with a wider knowledge, a larger charity, and far more chance of usefulness, for that one night's debate.

One question of the deepest interest and the greatest importance yet remains for discussion. What assistance may we hope from the complete emancipation of the older universities, towards the training and education of the ministers of our Free Churches? It is not needful to dwell upon the advantages that would follow if they could resort more generally to Oxford or Cambridge. The value universally attributed to a university training by the clergy of the Established Church, and the frequent laments that we have heard of late from all quarters, lay as well as episcopal, on the increased proportion of the "literate" element among that clergy, are sufficient evidence of the benefits that might be anticipated. In an admirable paper read before the Congregational Union in October, 1869, by Mr. Neville Goodman, of Peterhouse, the special advantages afforded by Oxford and Cambridge in larger measure than any other of our English institutions are stated thus:—

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

1. A stimulus to high attainment such as is generated by the associations and from the very atmosphere of these ancient seats of learning.

2. A definiteness of thought and a precision of language which is ever the mark of a scholar, and more especially of the gregarious scholar.

3. Last and not least. A certain social status, which is of some practical value.

It may seem strange that nothing has been said of the direct educational advantages; but it must be remembered that Mr. Goodman was speaking especially of students of theology. And in spite of the fact that about one-half of the graduates of Oxford and Cambridge have usually gone into the Church (the proportion, be it noticed in passing, among high-honours men has been very much less), and that, as Mr. H. H. Vaughan put it, "a man who can take a degree is already, in point of attainments, three-fourths of a clerk in orders, but is not one-fourth of any other profession," the advantages for the study of theology have been hitherto singularly meagre. We need but glance over the shelves of any well-furnished theological library to see how small, how ridiculously small have been the contributions made to this department of knowledge by the old universities. And yet even here we cannot rate the advantages at nothing. Hebrew has been confessedly the weakest point of our English sacred scholarship, and the conservative tendencies of our students have here been most prejudicial; but in this respect the last few years have witnessed a marked improvement. The introduction of honours at the Voluntary Theological Examination has greatly promoted the study of Hebrew among the younger graduates, and a fair proportion of those who have thus been induced to enter on the field have continued to cultivate it with marked success. If our own theological students would fail to obtain at Oxford or Cambridge the advantages in this respect that they might secure at some of the German universities, yet they would find in several of the colleges education superior to that which can now be given in denominational institutions, where several extensive and important subjects have to be assigned to the same professor. As regards the Greek Testament, the advantages are more unquestioned.

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

The refined and accurate scholarship which Cambridge especially is able to boast of, when applied to the Sacred Writings, results in a method of hermeneutics unrivalled in precision. Attendance on the lectures of a man like Canon Lightfoot furnishes an intellectual discipline to which I know nothing in its way that is comparable. And we must not forget that every improvement in the teaching power of the universities, especially the establishment of university lecturers such as those which have been already suggested, will have its effect in the department of theology. Of course the greater part of the theological instruction of our future ministers must be conducted in special institutions. In dogmatic, polemic, and pastoral theology, and in homiletics, guidance must always be given by men in whom the churches have confidence. But it may be possible for our students while pursuing their literary and scientific training to lay a basis of sound exegetical knowledge, which shall prove of the greatest service to them afterwards. And highest of all the advantages which would follow from a training at the old universities would be the precision of thought and language that might be thus produced. Mr. Goodman states this well in the following words: "Classical scholars and mathematicians, and even those who associate with them, are likely to avoid that looseness in reasoning, that indiscriminate latitude and vagueness of language, which is the bane of current literature and of modern rhetoric. In order to prevent a man from rushing into wild absurdities concerning matters about which he knows but little, two things are requisite. He must know some one science well, or at least be acquainted with the nature of the induction by which it has been built up, and he must believe that other sciences are capable of being treated with the same exactitude as is employed in his own course of study. Hence this definiteness of thought is likely to be the peculiar product of places where many branches of study are pursued so thoroughly that each student must select his own branch, while he associates with and respects those who have adopted other lines of study." It may be of little direct service to the Christian minister that he has studied the *Ethics* of Aristotle, or the *Differential Calculus*; but it is of immediate service that he should have learnt to frame connected and

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

logical systems of thought, and to detect any flaw in a chain of reasoning.

But if the advantages of a university education are unquestionable, the difficulties in the way of providing it are not less indubitable, and spring directly from the fundamental conception of the Christian minister, as held by the Independent churches. If the ministry were simply a profession, for which all that was needed was a sound professional training, the matter would be greatly simplified. In the Romish Church it is so regarded, and all that is needful in addition to that which is supplied by education, is supposed to be given by the mysterious grace imparted by the imposition of episcopal hands. The *priest* can be trained from his earliest years to the right discharge of the functions of his office; for him no special and personal call is needed; a decent external morality, and adequate instruction in the mystic rites which he has to perform on behalf of the people, are all that is required of him. The Anglican Church in this, as in so much else, has taken up a position which is one of compromise, and therefore of necessity illogical. It requires at ordination the profession of a belief in a personal call, and yet by its very constitution it is unable in any way to test the reality of any such call. A very small modicum of theological knowledge, and testimonials of good conduct, are the only requirements made of those who wish to enter holy orders. And after ordination, the sole test of fitness to minister in holy things, to a certain congregation, is the discretion of a patron, lay or episcopal. The necessary tendency of such a condition of things is that the Church is looked upon solely as a profession. Younger sons are destined to particular livings, we may almost say, before their birth; and boys of the tenderest age are set apart for the clerical office, and trained for it with little or no regard to their personal fitness. The advantage resulting from this is evident: the whole course of education is made to bear upon the professional requirements; no time is wasted; no hindrances stand in the way of a continuous training. But the evils far outweigh the advantages. The Christian ministry traces its descent, not from the priest, but from the prophet; and it is the saddest mockery under heaven when it

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

is held by one in whose spirit no spark of the prophet's fire is blazing. It is of incalculable advantage that the Christian minister should be soundly trained, and widely cultivated; that he should be a wise and learned teacher, a skilful physician of souls. But these gifts sink into nothing when severed from that which alone gives them their power on the hearts of men. To use the noble and eloquent words of a recent writer: "Unless the Christian minister has the obvious call of the prophet, to speak as from the heart, and with the authority of God, he might as well hold his peace. If he have the moral courage, the spiritual insight, the penetration into the mysteries of God's providence, the spiritual understanding of the meaning of God's word, the predictive sense, the strong strange commerce with the unseen and the eternal, the baptism and unction of the Holy Ghost, then he is a minister of God, he does open the kingdom of heaven, he binds and he looses, he forgives and remits sin; heaven and earth will pass away, but these words of his will not pass away." This is the final and sufficient justification of the method of popular election on which the churches of Independency are based. It has its many disadvantages; and the sarcasms of opponents are not needed to bring them home to us; they are felt most keenly, and mourned most bitterly, by many of the best among us; and they cannot pass away wholly, till all the imperfections of a fallen humanity are banished. But we hold most firmly to the belief, that the instinct of a Christian church is a far truer test of the presence of the vital prophetic power than the judgment of any bishop, patron, or presbytery. The power of a man to inspire and guide in the life that is divine, is measured best by those who feel that they are guided and inspired. But the presence of this power is not a thing that can be foretold in boyhood, or infused by training. We must always keep a firm grasp on the principle which has hitherto guided the selection of students for the ministry; that wherever this power is recognized there it shall be trained and developed, and whatever of culture and discipline may be possible, shall be superadded to it, as valuable additions to the one thing needful. If the National Universities are to be of service for the training of the Independent ministry, it must always be in strict subservience

to the primary law of its existence. At present a large proportion of our students consists of those who have been for a time in trade or business. The irresistible impulse which urges them to the work of the ministry does not come upon them for years after they have entered on the practical work of life. Their fitness has been tested by labours in the Sunday-school, and by help in cottage or village services. But meanwhile their education has been intermitted, and the greater part of the little learnt at school has been utterly forgotten. They live very frequently under conditions which make it simply impossible that they should do much before their admission into college towards making up their deficiencies. In cases such as these, and they are very numerous, a preliminary training, of two or three years at least, would be needed before they would be fit to avail themselves of the advantages of Oxford or Cambridge. The course there would last for at least three years, and then the candidates for the ministry would only be prepared to commence their training in theology. It is evident that an education extending over eight or nine years is entirely out of the question, especially in the case of men who commence it when they are far past boyhood. Must we then admit that the restoration of the National Universities to the people at large will remain without its effect on the classes that now supply a large proportion of our Nonconformist pulpits? I fear that to a very great degree it must always be so. But another process is going on, which will do much to supply what is wanted. It has long been the hope of educational reformers to secure, if the expression may be allowed to pass, greater continuity in the application of the public school endowments. In order that the highest education that the country can supply may be placed within the reach of all, however poor and humbly born, who show that they are fit to profit by it, we need a system of successive exhibitions from the primary schools to the secondary, from the secondary (or elementary classical) to the higher grammar and public schools, and from these again to the universities. The lowest round of the ladder of education should be placed within the easy reach of all; and diligence and ability should be able to secure his gradual rise to the top of it. The enlightened energy of the

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

Endowed School Commissioners, and their active subordinates, is doing very much towards the attainment of what seemed so long but a Utopian dream, and in spite of the resistance of local obstructives, and the representatives of "vested interests," its realization, at least in part, cannot now be long delayed. When it is completed, we may fairly hope for the dawn of a new and brighter era for the higher education of the country.

The universities are constantly endeavouring to extend the range of their studies, and to make provision within due limits for every variety of intellectual tastes. The education that they offer is no longer calculated solely to meet the requirements of two or three of the learned professions; for whatever form of active life, professional or commercial, a student is endeavouring to prepare himself, he will find very much the study of which will directly repay him (even from this lower point of view) in some one or other of the various courses prescribed for graduation. Business men are getting to recognize this, and many of the shrewdest as well as the wisest of them are willing that their sons should pass from the university, rather than the school, to the warehouse and the counting-house. We may see, and it is one of the most hopeful signs that we can see, many indications that a university career is less and less regarded as the special privilege of certain professions, and more and more as the common heritage of intelligent Englishmen. It is in this direction mainly that I am inclined to look for the extension of culture and learning among our Nonconformist ministry. Little, I fear, can be done to enable those who now frequent our colleges to avail themselves of the advantages of Oxford and Cambridge. The majority would be unfit to profit by them; the expense of sending them to the colleges already in existence would be so great as to make the idea impracticable; and the institution of new denominational colleges would be liable to the gravest and most fatal objections.* But surely as the number of our Nonconformist graduates increases, and especially as the sons of our ministers fight their way through the great schools to the universities, we may hope to see many of them consecrating

* For the proof of these points I must be content to refer to the excellent paper by Mr. Neville Goodman, from which I have already quoted.

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

the training and the culture they have won to the service of Christ in the ministry of His Church. We have had instances already in which men who have gained all but the highest honours of Cambridge, have devoted themselves to the work of the Nonconformist pastor. And these, we may fairly trust, are but the scanty first-fruits of the harvest that the coming years shall reap. Then as the supply of such able stewards of the mysteries of God increases, we shall find them filling the leading posts, and by degrees eliminating by a lawful process of natural selection, those who, to not less zeal and earnestness, have failed to add the same rich training. There will yet be work for all to do: not one who feels that he has within him a message for the souls of his fellows need be silenced; but in humbler spheres their energy will find full play. There will still be the village station, the cottage service. The recognized pastor of the church will need his hand strengthened and his heart cheered by the occasional assistance of those who are able in season to give a word of comfort and of exhortation to the brethren. Nay more, he will often feel it an inestimable advantage, that while he retains the responsibility of the guidance and instruction of his people, they may sometimes be addressed by one, who, no less gifted with the prophetic fire, speaks to them with a knowledge of the sins and temptations of business life, to which he himself can make no claim. The time may yet be coming when the majority of the Nonconformist pulpits shall be filled with trained university scholars, aided and strengthened by many who, lacking the culture and the knowledge needed for a regular pastorate, shall yet do God and man good service by occasional ministrations. The step may seem to be long between the abolition of university tests, and the preaching of laymen; and yet it may well be that the one will not be without its extensive and lasting influence on the other. If free admission to the universities leads to the accession of any large number of cultivated graduates to the regular pastorate, we may fairly hope that no small amount of ill-trained energy that is now attracted into posts for which it is imperfectly adapted, will find its more legitimate exercise in humbler but still important spheres of Christian usefulness.

OUR NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

One other point remains to be briefly touched upon by way of conclusion to an Essay which has been perhaps unduly, but owing to the nature of its subject unavoidably, digressive. It cannot be doubted that ecclesiastical questions are destined to play a prominent part, if not the most prominent part, in the politics of the next few years. The struggle for religious liberty is over; the struggle for religious equality is approaching its inevitable issue; but a yet more arduous contest awaits us. Hitherto the question has been mainly one of justice: the Nonconformists of England have maintained that whatever a man's ecclesiastical principles, they ought to have nothing whatever to do with his rights as an English citizen. The victory here is fairly won. But the question yet remains for decision, what are the ecclesiastical principles that shall guide the policy of the English nation? Here the task is not to persuade the conscience to do the right, but to convince the intellect of what is true. And henceforth the Free Churches will have the assistance of a steadily growing body of cultivated men, resident at the centres of speculative thought, mixing freely with those that give form to the opposite opinions, of necessity respected for their character and attainments, and learning in the unrestrained intercourse of a common college life that thorough acquaintance with their adversaries' position that, in controversy as in war, is the first and the greatest step towards carrying it. I believe that in the movement of the coming years no mean or unimportant part will be played by the resident Nonconformist fellows of the Oxford and Cambridge colleges.

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

IN RELATION TO

MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

THE supreme fact in the history of the world—perhaps in the history of the universe—is that God has become man in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ. Through Him it is possible for all men, not only to obtain the forgiveness of sin, and deliverance from eternal destruction, but to receive the very life of God. The life is more than raiment, and whatever varieties of theological creed and ecclesiastical polity may exist among those who have been “made partakers of the Divine nature,” however widely they may be separated from each other by bitter controversies, by mutual suspicion and hostility, and by the evil traditions of dark and evil times, their transcendental unity is indestructible. But it is not my intention to discuss the nature or the supernatural prerogatives and glories of the Catholic Church. These have been already illustrated in an earlier paper in this series.*

Nor is it my intention to discuss, except incidentally, the conflicting claims of the great Churches of Christendom or the merits of rival systems of ecclesiastical polity. As a Congregationalist, I believe that Congregationalism is not only a legitimate form of ecclesiastical organization, but that it is sanctioned by whatever authority belongs to the example and practice of the Churches of the first century. “We for our parts,” said John Robinson, “as we do believe by the Word of

* “The Catholic Church,” by the Rev. H. R. Reynolds, D.D.

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

God, that the things we teach are not new, but old things renewed; so are we no less fully persuaded that the Church constitution in which we are set is cast in the apostolical and primitive mould, and not one day nor hour younger, in the nature and form of it, than the first Church of the New Testament." This position has been maintained by a long succession of controversial writers; and it has been conceded by eminent Church historians and distinguished theologians who were not themselves Congregationalists.

Most modern Congregationalists, however, would admit that the polity of the Church is not a matter of positive institution, and that although the Church order established by the apostles ought not to be departed from except for very grave and sufficient reasons, there is no formal authority restraining the Church from varying its organization to enable it to meet the varying exigencies of its history. That any adequate reasons have ever arisen for suppressing the ecclesiastical independence of separate congregations, and depriving them of the free choice of their own officers and the ultimate control of their own ecclesiastical affairs, we should deny; and most of us would probably maintain that no such reasons are conceivable. We should also contend that *formally* a religious society ceases to be a Church when it ceases to require personal union with Christ as the condition of communion with itself, and when it consciously, voluntarily, and of deliberate purpose, includes within its limits what John Robinson, after the manner of his age, calls "a mingled generation of the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent." But "the communion of saints," though it may be hindered, cannot be wholly destroyed, by defective ecclesiastical organization, and it is certain that the Idea of the Church has been realized, more or less perfectly, under the most dissimilar forms of Church polity. It has been realized in many of the monastic communities of the Church of Rome, in Wesleyan class-meetings, in the unorganized congregations of the English Establishment, in the meetings for worship of the Society of Friends, and in the services of the Plymouth Brethren. The true Form of the Church may be absent, and yet the Idea of the Church may be present, though imperfectly developed and expressed.

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

On the other hand, where the Form is maintained, the Life may be lost. It is one of the great perils of modern Congregationalism that while it preserves the apostolic polity, it does not apprehend very vividly the Idea from which that polity sprang, and for the sake of which alone it deserves preservation. We have exaggerated and misinterpreted the great Protestant principle that religion is an affair that lies altogether between man and his Maker. In the energy of our revolt against the interference of secular rulers with the religious life of nations, and in the vehemence of our antagonism to the presumptuous claims of priesthoods and to the illegitimate pretensions of the great Churches of Christendom, we have sometimes appeared to maintain that the whole idea of religion is included in the immediate relations between the soul and God. The relations between the individual Christian and the Church have been ignored. The necessity for the existence of the Church has been implicitly denied.

But nothing can be clearer than that isolation is not the law of the religious life. The supernatural action of the Holy Ghost is not indeed restrained by any inflexible method. Infants are made "partakers of the Divine nature" without the interference of any human agency, and inherit everlasting blessedness in Christ, although they pass away from the world before they can receive any advantage from the ministry or services of the Church. There may be immediate revelations of God to the soul which has never heard of Christ, quickening it to penitence, and creating passionate yearnings for rest and life in an almost unknown God. But, normally, spiritual activity is originated and developed under other conditions. We are restored to God by those to whom God is already revealed. We are taught His will by those who are already doing it. God shares with those who have already repented of sin, and trusted in His mercy, the blessedness of prevailing upon other men to repent and to believe. He will not do this great work alone. He will not accomplish it even through angelic agency. When the glory of Christ appeared to Saul on his way to Damascus, the persecutor did not receive, direct from Heaven, a perfect revelation of Christian truth and duty: the Lord said to him, "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

be told thee what thou must do." When he had reached Damascus, "a vision" came, not to Saul himself, but to "a certain disciple . . . named Ananias," and Ananias was sent to him that he might both receive his sight and "be filled with the Holy Ghost." "The angel of the Lord," who might have appeared himself to the Ethiopian eunuch, sent Philip to meet the chariot of the stranger, and to interpret to him the ancient prophecies of the Messiah. An angel came to Cornelius, but only to tell him to send for Peter.

The same law still determines the Divine action. The saints of past generations teach us the truth and will of God. St. John tells us how Christ insisted on the necessity of the New Birth as the condition of entrance into the kingdom of Heaven. We learn from St. Paul that we are to be justified by Faith. Our hearts are touched by the story of Christ's infinite compassion for the sorrows and sins of mankind, as told by St. Matthew and St. Luke. Or it is Augustine's fierce and terrible struggle with sin, as recorded in his Confessions, which reveals to us our need of the Divine mercy. Or we discover how far away we are from God by the intimate communion with him of Thomas à Kempis. More commonly it is the devoutness of living men which convinces us of the guilt of an irreligious life. We are taught by our parents to love and fear God. The warnings of the preacher create alarm; what he tells us of the grace of Christ inspires Faith. We owe the very origin of our religious earnestness to the ministry either of the living or of the dead.

And, as we are not alone in our first return to God, we continue to be dependent upon human teaching and influence for the perfecting of our spiritual strength and knowledge. Many of God's best gifts do not come to us direct from His own hand. Our ideal of Christian holiness is heightened and ennobled by the lives and characters of saints. The patient suffering of the sick and the poor, and their quiet trust in God's love, rebuke our despondency and discontent, and we learn from them the meaning of Divine promises. The fervour of apostles kindles the fire of zeal in our own hearts; the depth and vehemence of their love for Christ, intensifies our own love for Him. Our knowledge of God is enlarged by

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

the teaching of men who have received more of "the spirit of wisdom and revelation" than ourselves. We are reminded of neglected duty and of forgotten truth by public or private remonstrance and exhortation. While the direct illumination of the Holy Ghost is necessary for all true spiritual knowledge, it is not in our solitary thoughts alone that we are taught of God; and the supernatural energy which is the strength of all Christian perfection is revealed in its highest forms when we are in most intimate communion with those who are "filled with the Spirit."

Nor can the regenerate soul in its healthiest and most vigorous condition endure spiritual solitude. Its hunger for communion with those who love Christ is almost as keen as its hunger for communion with Christ Himself. When St. Paul was warning the Thessalonian Christians against gross sensual sins, he added, "but as touching brotherly love ye need not that I write unto you; for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another." And St. John said, "By this we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." But where there is love for other men, there will be a strong desire for intercourse and union with them; voluntary isolation will be impossible. John Owen puts this very forcibly, and with a pathetic allusion to the troubles through which the Nonconformists were passing at the time he was writing. He says that the perpetuation of the Church in the world depends partly on

"the instinct of the new creature, and those in whom it is, to associate themselves in holy communion for the joint and mutual exercise of those graces of the Spirit which are the same, as unto the essence of them, in them all. . . . And, therefore, none of His [Christ's] true disciples, since He had a Church upon the earth, did or could satisfy themselves in their own faith singularly and personally; but would venture their lives and all that was dear unto them for communion with others, and the associating themselves with them of the same spirit and way, for the observance of the commands of Christ. The martyrs of the primitive Churches of old lost more of their blood and lives for their meetings and assemblies than for personal profession of the faith; and so also have others done under the Roman apostasy. It is a usual plea among them who engage in the persecution or

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

punishment of such as differ from them, that if they please they may keep their opinions, their consciences, and faith unto themselves, without meetings for communion or public worship; and herein they suppose they deal friendly and gently with them. And this is our present case. It is true, indeed, as Tertullian observed of old, that men in these things have no power over us but what they have from our own wills: we willingly choose to be, and to continue, what they take advantage to give us trouble for. And it is naturally in our power to free ourselves from them and their laws every day. But we like it not; we cannot purchase outward peace and quietness at any such rate. But, as was said, the inward instinct of believers, from the same principles of faith, love, and all the graces of the Spirit in them all, doth efficaciously lead and incline them unto their joint exercise in societies, unto the glory of Christ, and their own edification, or increase of the same graces in them.”*

The temper of our times is, no doubt, very different from that of the more vigorous ages of the Church. Many excellent people must be surprised that in times of danger, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews should have said to the Jewish Christians, “Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together.” To require men to attend public worship, if it involved them in any serious risks, would seem to us very preposterous and fanatical. Very slight reasons appear to constitute a sufficient ground for neglecting this duty or for discharging it very irregularly. We are suffering from slight indisposition; or we have far to walk, and the weather is hot and the roads are dusty; or it threatens to rain; or the pink May and the chestnut blossoms are in their glory, and the cool shade of an elm tree tempts us to an hour’s dreamy meditation; or the preacher is dull; or there is to be a Sermon and a Collection for some Institution in which we feel no interest; and so we stop at home. It seems to be supposed that we can pray to God just as devoutly when we are alone as when we are worshipping with our Christian brethren; that the solitary reading of the Holy Scriptures and of good books is likely to do us quite as much good as listening to most sermons; that the public services of the Church may be very useful to Christian people who have not much intelligence or moral vigour, but

* “Inquiry concerning Evangelical Churches.” Works, vol. xv., p. 256.

that they are of no great importance to men of liberal culture and force of character; and such men go to public worship, not because their spiritual instincts make it necessary for themselves, but to support what they regard as an institution which does something to maintain religious faith among the ignorant and the poor, and for the sake of example. It is doubtful whether there exists any such strong conviction of the necessity of religious communion with others as would lead any considerable number of us to expose ourselves to serious danger rather than cease to worship with the Church. We might indeed suffer the worst penalties which persecuting laws could inflict rather than submit to a tyrannical interference with our religious Freedom; but it was not for the sake of Freedom, but for the sake of communion with the Church, that the martyrs of early times, and the Huguenots, the Covenanters, and the Nonconformists of later days defied the secular power. When they imperilled their fortunes, their liberty, and their lives, they were not thinking of vindicating a right and resisting an injustice, but of satisfying the irrepressible cravings of their spiritual nature.

The tendency to religious isolation which seems just now to have great strength in all Protestant communities in this country, is a sign either of the weakness of the religious life or of its abnormal development. From those great days which followed the coming of the Holy Ghost when "all that believed were together, and had all things common," and when they continued "daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house," down to the Evangelical Revival of the last century, a healthy intensity of spiritual life has always manifested itself in the breaking down of the barriers by which men were divided. Neither differences of social position, nor differences of culture, nor differences of race, have been strong enough to repress in regenerate souls the consciousness of their union with each other; and there has been a persistent endeavour to realize, to assert, and to express that union in common worship, even at the peril of life itself.

The energy of this passion for spiritual communion with other men would, of itself, constitute an adequate proof that

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

it was not God's purpose that the soul should reach its consummate strength and joy in solitary communion with Himself. The strong and permanent impulses of the supernatural life reveal the Divine idea of human duty. The Law of God, according to the ancient promise, is written on the regenerate heart.

But our Lord Jesus Christ Himself explicitly confirmed the authority of the inward law. He encouraged the instinctive desire for spiritual fellowship with others, and the instinctive impatience of spiritual isolation. He gave a special promise to common prayer: "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of My Father which is in Heaven."* He declared that He is specially present in some mysterious and wonderful way where "two or three are gathered together" in His name.† His most characteristic representations of the spiritual life, and of our relations to Himself, contradict the theory that Religion lies altogether between the individual soul and God. He does not speak of us as being separately rooted in Himself, but as being branches of one great Vine, sharing a common life, living in each other as well as in Him. According to the unanimous conviction of Congregationalists, the Lord's Supper is not to be celebrated by a solitary communicant; it is a Festival in which Christian men sit together at the Table of Christ; and hence, whatever exceptional intimacy and freedom of intercourse with Christ we have a right to expect when He invites us to approach Him, not as His servants but as His guests and His friends, whatever exceptional wealth of spiritual blessing He confers when He gives us the Bread and the Wine which are the symbols of His Body and His Blood, are not to be attained in solitary religious acts; they are made dependent upon our communion with our Christian brethren.

There is nothing arbitrary in all this. It is but the re-appearance, in the spiritual sphere, of a law which governs the whole course of human development, and of a divine idea which lies at the very foundation of the moral order of the universe, so far as that order is known to us. The theory of Individualism, in its exaggerated form, is flagrantly incon-

* Matt. xviii. 19.

† Matt. xviii. 20.

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

sistent with the whole organization of human life. Isolation is impossible to man. We cannot stand alone. The most vigorous genius is not developed altogether from within. It receives as much as it gives. It inherits the wealth accumulated by former generations; it appropriates and transfigures the thought of its contemporaries; in its noblest and most daring creations it is never absolutely original. Michael Angelo could never have designed St. Peter's, nor could Shakespeare have written Hamlet, nor could Kant have elaborated the Critical Philosophy, had they lived among barbarians.

No tenable theory of conscience ascribes to our moral perceptions an absolutely independent development. If, in a sense, moral ideas are innate, they are not realized in consciousness until we have entered into moral relations with other men, and have been disciplined by the traditions and institutions of Society. Our ideal of virtue is largely determined by the spirit and temper of the people among whom we live. Every nation, every Church, has its characteristic type of moral perfection. The Catholic type is different from the Protestant; the European from the Asiatic. The development of conscience varies with the varying pursuits of men; the ethical ideas of a merchant, or a statesman, are not identical with the ethical ideas of a solitary student; and masters and servants are continually discovering that they have not the same moral code, but that their conflicting interests have modified their very conceptions of their mutual obligations. There is an eternal law of righteousness, but it is not revealed to us direct from heaven. There is a Divine "light which lighteth every man," but it does not shine with uniform clearness and brightness; it is refracted by earthly mists and clouds; it is obscured by the sins of other men as well as by our own. According to the Divine order of the world, Conscience is not developed under the influence of direct inspiration merely; it is rarely possible that a man's moral ideal should far transcend that of his country and his age.

It is this law of inter-dependence, this vital union of men with each other, which underlies the darkest mysteries and the divinest glories of the moral universe. We are not isolated individuals, but members of a race. We cannot dissolve our

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

relations to mankind. It is not true, without qualification, that we have our life and character and destiny in our own hands. We are involved in all the sins and follies of past generations, and their wisdom and virtue are ours. To say that we inherit the consequences of the crimes and of the heroic goodness of former ages, and that we receive benefit or suffer harm from the virtues and vices of living men, is an imperfect expression of the truth. Language like this suggests that our relations to the race are merely external; that the conduct of other men affects our circumstances, not ourselves. But the very fountains of our moral life are troubled and poisoned by sins which are not our own. I cannot escape the sense of personal guilt when I yield to the impulse of an evil passion, but the strength of that passion is often the memorial of ancestral vice. My moral weakness is my sin and my shame, but it is often the direct result of the follies of my progenitors. Nor is the moral influence of living men over each other explained by what is called the power of example. Vicious passions are contagious. Courage, generosity, hopefulness, travel like fire from heart to heart. No sooner does a strong emotion begin to agitate the soul of one man, than kindred emotions begin to stir in the souls of other men. Passion creates passion. "Deep calleth to deep." There is an intensity of feeling of which most men are capable only when the feeling is shared by a crowd,—a fact which the Germans have recognized in one of their words for Enthusiasm (*Schwärmerei*). Armies are suddenly struck with a common panic. Great assemblies are moved by a common impulse. There is such a thing as a Spirit of the Age which takes possession of a whole generation and moulds its character and its faith. A nation is very much more than a collection of individual men, living in the same country, speaking the same language, and governed by the same laws; there is a national life common to all classes in the State, and whatever institutions interfere with the unity and intensity of that life, diminish national strength and imperil national stability.

Christian Theology has steadily refused to acknowledge that there can be any real separation between the individual and the life and fortunes of the race. It has elaborated the doctrine of Original Sin; it has maintained the corruption of

human nature; it has spoken of the Federal Relations of Adam to all his descendants. Nothing can be more technical, artificial, and unreal than many of the forms in which the truth has been expressed. Perhaps any expression of it must necessarily involve the most startling paradoxes. But every theological system which has had any life in it, has vigorously asserted the mysterious law by which we are involved—to put it in an extreme, exaggerated, and offensive form—not only in the consequences of each others' sins, but in the very sinfulness of those sins.

However difficult it may be to vindicate by an appeal to the authority of our Lord and of His apostles any theological definition and explanation of what is called the corruption or depravity of human nature, the New Testament explicitly affirms that every man is somehow implicated in the general sinfulness of mankind. It does not represent the life of the individual as a separate and independent moral development. Our Lord Himself recognized what may be described as the organic unity of the race when He spoke, as He so often spoke of "the world," and not merely of individual men, as being opposed to Himself, to Righteousness, and to Truth. When He condemned the Jews, He did not charge them merely with the guilt of the particular acts and dispositions in which they had manifested their hostility to Himself, but said, "Ye are of this world; I am not of this world."* "The world," He said, cannot "receive" the Spirit of Truth.† He described His triumph as the casting out of "the prince of this world."‡ The peace which He gives is not such "as the world giveth."§ His disciples cease to be "of the world."|| St. Paul connects the whole race in some mysterious way with Adam; "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners."¶ In his Epistle to the Galatians, the redemption of the individual is represented as a deliverance not merely from individual sin, but from "this present evil world."** Nor does redemption consist in the mere isolation of the redeemed from the community of unregenerate men; they are translated "into the kingdom of God's

* John viii. 23.

† John xiv. 27.

‡ John xii. 31.

§ John xiv. 27.

|| John xvii. 16.

¶ Rom. v. 19.

** Gal. i. 4.

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

dear Son."* They are made "fellow-citizens with the saints." They are received into "the household of God." They are "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone."† The same law which through human sin had wrought vast and universal evil, is now to play its part in securing and perfecting our eternal glory. We did not sin alone; we are not to be saved alone. It was not merely our individual sinfulness which paralyzed our moral strength, nor our personal crimes which cast their deep and awful shadows on our destiny. We were somehow implicated in the sins of the whole race, and involved in the catastrophe in which its guilt was rapidly culminating. It was not morally possible for any one of us to separate his destiny from the destiny of the rest of mankind, and to "redeem his own soul." Now that Redemption has been wrought for us by God, a union still more intimate and vital exists between all regenerate men, and when Redemption is perfected that union will be consummated. Already the common strength, and the common light, and the common joy of the Church belong to every Christian man. "We are members one of another." But as yet the ideal unity is not perfectly realized. The prayer of our Lord is the true Apocalypse. The glory of the Church will be consummated when that wonderful petition of His receives its complete answer, "That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us." Pantheism is but the ignoble perversion of a great Christian idea. Our personal life is not to be merged and lost in the infinite life of God; but the troubles and sins of the universe are to end in the "gathering together in one of all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth;" a common life—perfect, indestructible, and Divine—a life of which Christ is the Fountain, and of which His character and glory are the highest expression—will reveal its inexhaustible wealth and energy in the everlasting holiness and blessedness of angels and of saints.

But this common life dwells already in all regenerate souls, and it renders the spiritual isolation of those who have re-

* Col. i. 13.

† Eph. ii. 19, 20.

ceived it impossible. There is nothing, however, in the New Testament to indicate that our Lord Jesus Christ gave any directions to the apostles as to the form under which the communion of saints was to be realized. It is very doubtful whether any such directions were given. Nor were they necessary. The polity of the Church was to be the expression of its life. It was to be determined by the spiritual relations of its members to each other and to Christ. It was to be an organic growth, not a formal institution. When the Church came into existence on the Day of Pentecost, the apostles were not prepared with any system of ecclesiastical organization; and the development of the polity of the primitive Churches appears to have been as gradual as the development of apostolic doctrine.

Some form of organization, however, was inevitable. Those who acknowledged that the Lord Jesus was the Son of God and the Saviour of mankind, constituted, from the beginning, a separate community distinguished from their fellow-countrymen by their religious faith and practices, and united to each other by an intense and ardent mutual affection. They had frequent meetings for prayer and worship, and for communion with Christ in the Lord's Supper. It was necessary to determine when these meetings should be held, and where. It soon became necessary to create an organization for the distribution of the alms of the Church, and a special class of Church officers, chosen by the whole body of the faithful, was charged with this duty. The exceptional relationship of the apostles to the Church at Jerusalem appears to have delayed the institution of the ordinary Pastorate; but, elsewhere, it was obviously expedient that as soon as any number of persons became Christians, men of exceptional sagacity and force of character should be entrusted with the general superintendence of the religious affairs of the community, should preside at the meetings of the Church, and should be its recognized representatives. The official authority with which these men were invested was acknowledged by the apostles, who arranged for their appointment wherever a Church was founded.

In this account of the development of the organization of the apostolic Churches, it may be hastily inferred that the whole

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

ground on which the Independents are supposed to have rested their controversy with Presbyterianism and Diocesan Episcopacy, is surrendered. It may be urged that if the polity of the apostolic Churches was an organic growth, the Church of every age is at liberty to organize itself according to the law of its own life. The life of the first Churches may have expressed itself most naturally, and developed itself most vigorously, in the form of Congregationalism; but their practice does not bind us. In the absence of any definite system of ecclesiastical organization instituted by the apostles, and declared by them to be of universal and perpetual obligation, Presbyterianism or Diocesan Episcopacy may be just as legitimate as the more ancient polity. These forms of ecclesiastical government are the organic growth of later times. They were the natural expression of the temper and the spirit of the Church in the circumstances in which they were first developed; or they appeared to be necessary to consolidate its power; or they were in harmony with the habits and traditions of the nations which received the Christian Faith after the apostles had passed away. If it is once admitted that the organization of the primitive Churches was formed from within, and not impressed upon them by apostolic authority, how can it be shown that one form of Church polity is more in harmony with the will of Christ than another? The Church, instead of being under the control of apostolic law, "hath" not only "power to decree rites and ceremonies," and "authority in controversies of Faith," but freedom to determine from time to time all questions relating to its own organization. It may change the conditions of Church-membership; may transfer the supreme authority from the congregation of faithful men to which it belonged in apostolic times, to the ministers of the Church; may deprive separate congregations of their original independence, and place them under the government of diocesan bishops, with ecclesiastical jurisdiction extending over wide tracts of country and over the ministers and members of many congregations; or may vest the absolute control of the ecclesiastical affairs of a nation, or of many nations, in an assembly or a council; may vary indefinitely the constitution of such an assembly,—making it consist of the bishops of separate

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

Churches, or of bishops and unofficial representatives appointed by the free choice of the Christian commonalty, and changing, according to the temper and habits of different countries and different times, the relative proportion between its official and its representative members. If the Church is not absolutely bound by authoritative precepts or authoritative precedents, no restraints can be placed on its liberty. It is acknowledged that definite precepts do not exist; and if the practices of the apostolic Churches are merely illustrations of the development of the life of the Church in the accidental circumstances of the first century, the power of the Church to modify its polity is absolutely unlimited. The Puritan appeal to Scripture must be abandoned, and we are left, with Hooker, to consult the light of reason and to follow the lessons of experience.

Perhaps, the Puritans were not quite so irrational in their demand for scriptural authority on behalf of ecclesiastical organization and practice as is commonly supposed. They handled their argument in what modern theologians would call an unscientific manner; but the substance of it was not exactly what the readers of Hooker might imagine. Notwithstanding scores of possible quotations on the other side, they did not really mean that, to the end of time, the Church was to be bound by the mere mechanical arrangements of the primitive Churches. Their opponents might very fairly charge them with meaning this; they constantly used language which, without any illegitimate pressure, seemed to commit them to this absurdity; and yet they were really contending for something very much more reasonable. They felt that the "Idea" of the Church, as that Idea was apprehended in apostolic times, perished when there was any grave departure from the model of apostolic polity; their zeal for the form was, in fact, a zeal for the substance. They repudiated the folly, with which they were not unnaturally charged, of requiring definite scriptural authority for all the circumstances of public worship and for all the details of ecclesiastical practice.

John Owen maintains that very much must be left to Christian prudence and the light of nature. He says:—

"It is merely from a spirit of contention that some call on us or others to produce express testimony or institution for every circum-

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

stance in the practice of religious duties in the Church, and on a supposed failure therein, do conclude that they have power themselves to institute and ordain such ceremonies as they think meet, under a pretence of their being circumstances of worship, for as the directive light of nature is sufficient to guide us in these things, so the obligation of the Church unto it makes all stated additions to be useless, as on other accounts they are noxious."*

He says again:—

"Whatever is required by the *light of nature*, in such societies as Churches, as useful unto their order, and conducting unto their end, is a *Divine institution*. The Lord Christ, in the institution of Gospel Churches, their state, order, rule, and worship, doth not require of His disciples that in their observance of His appointments they should cease to be men, or forego the use and exercise of their rational abilities, according to the rule of that exercise which is the light of nature."†

It is true that Owen appears to limit very narrowly the province exempted from definite authority, and within which we are to be guided by the light of nature and that spiritual "wisdom, prudence, and understanding" which he says elsewhere are conferred upon the Church by the Lord Jesus Christ to this end; but he is certainly not open to the charge of a blind and superstitious determination to reproduce the mere mechanical structure and order of the primitive Churches. He distinguished between the substance of the Church and its accidental form; between the essential elements of worship which are permanent, and its circumstances, which may be varied according to varying times and places, the social condition of the people who constitute the Church, and their national traditions and customs.

There is no reason why Congregationalists should shrink from the boldest assertion of the principle that the Church of every age is perfectly free to make its organization the closest expression of its highest life, and the most effective means for securing the purpose for which an organized Church exists. Any form of ecclesiastical polity is legitimate which suppresses no

* "Inquiry concerning Evangelical Churches." Works, vol. xv., 231, 232.

† Ibid., 243.

great spiritual truth, and which satisfies the spiritual instincts which render the communion of saints necessary. But, if this principle is accepted, it must be applied firmly, and with the clearest intelligence of its real meaning. When the restraints of outward law are repudiated, it is necessary to insist with all the greater intensity on making the polity of the Church the expression of its own highest life. Everything must be subordinated to this. The polity must come from within; it must not be imposed from without; it may recognize external circumstances, but must not be controlled by them. If the organization of the Church is to be a vital growth, the life which it is to reveal is the life which the Church has received from Christ. Ecclesiastical statesmen have no right to construct various forms of polity to express the spirit and tendencies prevailing among different races of men, in different countries and in different churches; the polity of the Church must be created by the Idea of the Church.

Hence if it is alleged in justification of the elaborate organization of an Episcopal Church, with its ministers rising rank above rank from the obscurity of the diaconate to the splendour of the archbishopric, that such a system is in harmony with the aristocratic institutions of a nation like our own, the justification cannot be accepted as valid. Without discussing the question whether an aristocratic organization of Society may or may not be temporarily expedient and necessary, it is clear that among an aristocratic people it is one of the chief functions of the Church to maintain the spiritual equality of all men in the eye of God. Instead of increasing the perils of aristocratic institutions by constituting itself on an aristocratic basis, the Church is bound to diminish them by ignoring all distinctions of social rank among its ministers and members. According to the Idea of the Church, all who receive Christ are the brethren of Christ, "kings and priests unto God;" and that Idea is seriously endangered if the Church surrenders the utmost simplicity of polity.

On the same principle, we must reject as invalid the defence of a national organization of the Church which rests on the ground that it expresses the vigour and unity of national life. Patriotism is a noble passion and the strong ally of many.

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

masculine and lofty virtues; but it requires to be chastened and controlled by the sense of a larger Unity than that which is constituted by common blood, a common language, and common political institutions. A Church forgets its own Idea when by its very polity it confirms national isolation. In the Church there is "neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free." It is of no country. Its members are not to be recognized as English or French, American or German, but as men—men in whom all other distinctions are lost in this, that they have received the life of God.

It is an equally illegitimate plea for a system of ecclesiastical polity that it promotes the civilization and refinement of rude districts and uncultivated people, and places "a gentleman in every parish." To place "a gentleman in every parish" is no part of the Idea of the Church. If the Church were merely or mainly a political or social institution, intended to promote good order, and to improve the material, intellectual, and moral condition of mankind, the argument would have great force. Incidentally, the Church, no doubt, answers all these ends—answers them better, perhaps, than any institution which has these for its chief and immediate objects;—"the shadow of Peter passing by" still heals the sick;—but the Church is a supernatural society and exists for supernatural purposes; it is in relation to these, that its polity must be judged. When young people are choosing a house, they sometimes forget to consider whether the drainage is good and the water pure, and whether the aspect of the rooms in which they will have to live is north or south; but they are eloquent about a pretty paper in the drawing-room, and a charming Virginia-creeper that mantles the porch. To insist very much on the "gentleman in every parish" argument in discussing a system of ecclesiastical polity, exhibits an equal incapacity to subordinate mere accidental advantages to what is essential to life and health.

Nor is it a sufficient ground for adopting any form of ecclesiastical organization, that it is favourable to the creation of a learned ministry. Great as are the advantages which the Church may derive from the learning both of its ministers and

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

of its unofficial members, secular learning is not necessary to the Church; the Idea of the Church can be realized without it.

It is still less legitimate to maintain any system of ecclesiastical polity, because it secures an adequate ministerial income for every minister of the Church. That there is justice in providing generous maintenance for men whose whole time and strength are devoted to ministerial work is incontestable; but it is not necessary that every minister should be released from secular business, and should depend upon the liberality of the Church for his support. The greatest of the apostles worked with his own hands, and it is quite possible that, with the noblest form of ecclesiastical polity, it may sometimes be necessary for very efficient ministers to do the same.

If a Church organization rests on the hypothesis that it is not safe to entrust the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs to the direct control of ordinary Christian men, and that for the sake of avoiding the perils of a democratic Church order, supreme authority should be vested in the official rulers of the Church, or centralized in representative assemblies, it is necessary to insist on the descriptions given in the New Testament of the great qualities which belong to all who are in Christ, and on the special presence of Christ which is assured even to "two or three" who are met together "in His Name." Any form of Church polity which denies that every congregation of Christian men may have the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit in the conduct of its own religious affairs is self-condemned.

Though no sufficient objection can be urged, on the ground of abstract principle, against this method of judging every system of polity by its relations to the Idea of the Church, and without any reference to apostolic precedent, the more natural method is to consider how it happened that the apostolic order was so soon changed, the moral and spiritual influences which suggested innovations, and the loss or gain to the Idea of the Church which these innovations involved.

It can be shown, I think, that every successive departure from the original polity was the result of growing weakness in the spiritual life of the Church, and of declining faith in those

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

great spiritual forces on which alone the Church should rely for its own security and for its victory over the errors, the sins, and the sorrows of mankind. It can be shown that these innovations gradually suppressed the recognition of the spiritual equality of all Christian men, encouraged priestly pretensions, and injured the free development of the supernatural life in the commonalty of the Church. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." When the Church has been most vividly conscious of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, it has cared least for a complicated and elaborate polity; and the deceptive supports of a strong organization have been created to compensate for the loss of a vigorous life.

It is one principal advantage of this historical method of investigating the claims of various forms of ecclesiastical polity, that it does not require us to start with a perfect theory of the Church; element after element essential to a complete theory will be suggested as the inquiry proceeds. As the rise of every new heresy, with the conflict which it provoked, has enabled the Church to apprehend more fully, as well as to define with greater exactness, the original faith "once delivered to the saints," every innovation on the apostolic order of the Church, by its violation of some prerogative originally possessed by every member of the Church, and by its implicit denial of some great spiritual truth, may reveal to us more perfectly that great Idea which the organized community of believers is intended to express and fulfil.

The intention of this paper, however, is not to establish, by either of these methods, the legitimacy of the Congregational polity, which, as a Congregationalist writing for Congregationalists, I take for granted, but to consider the relations of the Idea of the Church to the spirit and faith and practices of Modern Congregationalism. Of that Idea the organization and customs which we have inherited from our fathers may be a true expression, and yet we ourselves may be false to it. The principal topics which, in the present condition of Congregationalism, it appears necessary to discuss are these: the Idea of the Church in relation to the Persons who should constitute the Church; in relation to their Communion with each other;

in relation to the Power of the Church; and in relation to Theological Creeds.

I. The Idea of the Church in relation to the Persons who should constitute the Church.

The question as to the Persons who should constitute the Church is virtually answered by what has been already said concerning the way in which the Church came into existence. There is nothing in the Acts of the Apostles to suggest that those who received the Gospel on the Day of Pentecost were deliberately and formally organized as a religious Society. The Church organized itself. It assumed an external and visible form—just as the life of the Vine takes form in its branches, its leaves, its blossoms, and its fruit—by the law of its own life. Those who were born again of the Holy Ghost came together because they could not remain apart. No pressure was put upon them by the apostles. It was the strong consciousness of common affections, common hopes, and common joys which created the first Christian Community. No external law bound its members together. They had the same creed—a very simple one,—but this was not the secret of their union. They had become members of a new race and had passed into a new world. From the very first, supernatural gifts of wisdom and of utterance bore witness that they had received a supernatural life. These gifts were not intended merely to minister to the development of the knowledge and strength of those who believed in Christ, or to confirm the claims of the Gospel on the faith of mankind; they were the revelation of the supernatural character of the kingdom into which the followers of Christ had entered. The penalties inflicted on Ananias and Sapphira, and on Elymas the sorcerer, were the visible expression of those awful powers which vindicate the sanctity and majesty of the laws of the kingdom of heaven, now at last founded on earth; and the beneficent miracles which were wrought, not by the apostles alone, but by innumerable Christian men, were visible illustrations of diviner benefits conferred on the loyal subjects of that kingdom. It was not a matter of choice, or even of duty, but a matter of necessity that those who had risen together into the sphere of the

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

supernatural, should have fellowship with each other in prayer and thanksgiving, and should exult together in the strange and unexpected deliverance which God had wrought for them.

As the Church came into existence as the direct result of the energy of that Divine life which was revealed in the first believers, it is natural to conclude that it belongs to the very Idea of the Church that this life should be possessed by all its members. If the Church was created as the necessary expression of the union of those who possessed a common life, it is inconceivable that men who do not share this life can have any place in the Church. This position is confirmed by the descriptions, contained in the apostolic epistles, of the Churches to which the epistles are addressed. The Church of the Thessalonians is described as being "in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." The Philippian Christians are "saints in Christ Jesus." The Christians at Ephesus are said to be "blessed . . . with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ;" St. Paul tells them that God "quickened" them, "together with Christ," and that they "sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." The Colossians were "buried with Christ in baptism," wherein also they "have risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." They are "dead," and their "life is hid with Christ in God."

In writing to one Church, St. Paul may have occasion to condemn grave doctrinal errors into which some of its members had fallen; in writing to another, he may have occasion to rebuke it sharply for tolerating gross moral offences; sometimes he feels it necessary to write moral precepts which indicate that the conscience of Christian men was most imperfectly developed; sometimes, through their defective knowledge, he has to illustrate the very elements of the Christian Faith; but he never loses sight of the Ideal; for him a Church is always a society of men who have received the Holy Ghost, and entered into the Kingdom of Heaven.

Nor has this conception disappeared even in those Churches which have departed farthest from the apostolic type of polity. The great tradition of better times still survives. The Church of Rome includes vast numbers of persons who exhibit no signs

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

of the possession of the supernatural life; but, according to its hypothesis, all its members have received the divine life in baptism. Although the Church of England has no provision for the maintenance of "godly discipline," it has never sunk so low as to regard every man who happens to have been born in England as belonging to its communion; its communion is restricted to baptized persons, all of whom it declares to be regenerate of the Holy Ghost; and consistently with this, it refuses to pronounce over the unbaptized dead the words of thanksgiving and confident hope with which it commits all its members to the grave. That, in theory, a Church should ever cease to insist on the participation of the life of God as essential to communion with itself, is hardly conceivable. If this is deliberately surrendered, the Church can be regarded no longer as a supernatural society; it becomes a mere Club, an organization distinguished from the Royal Institution, or the College of Surgeons, or the Association for the Promotion of Social Science, or a Freemasons' Lodge, only by its greater antiquity, and the superior importance of the objects for which it is maintained.

The polity of the Congregational Churches requires in the most distinct and emphatic manner the possession of the supernatural life as the supreme, and, as I think, the only indispensable condition of Church Membership. They receive members, only on the declaration of their personal faith in Christ. No man is a member of a Congregational Church by birth. Nor is Baptism a sufficient qualification for membership; nor an orthodox creed; nor a blameless moral life. For three hundred years, whatever changes may have passed upon our theology, and whatever modifications may have been introduced into the details of our Church organization, we have steadily and with unflinching fidelity maintained that only those who are in Christ have any right to be in the Church.

Nor do I know that there are any of us who have consciously renounced this principle. And yet during the last few years there have been some discussions which suggest the necessity of insisting on the truth that, according to the Idea of the Church, the Church should consist only of the regenerate. We have heard something occasionally about "the Church member-

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

ship of children." If those who use this phrase meant nothing more than to affirm that children who love God and cling to the infinite goodness of Christ have a right to be received into Church communion; if they meant to protest against the perverse folly of requiring, as signs of the presence of the Holy Ghost in a child, the sharp agony of repentance for sin, and all the shame and conflict and fear which are natural only in those who have sinned against God for twenty or thirty years; if they meant to maintain that in a Christian household children may be drawn to God, they know not how, may find themselves in the flock of the Good Shepherd, listening to His voice and resting at His feet, without any consciousness of ever having wandered into the rocky and perilous wilderness;—if this were all, then there would be no reason for apprehension. Or if they intended only to remind the Church of its forgotten and neglected duties to the children of its members—duties which have been forgotten and neglected in our very eagerness to rescue from ignorance and irreligion the children of those who are outside—they would be rendering us good service. But by those who use it, the phrase "the Church-membership of children" appears to be intended to assert the claims of baptized children, or of the children of Christian parents, to be acknowledged as Church members by virtue of their Baptism or of their Birth. The Birth seems, however, to be regarded as of primary importance; Baptism is a very subordinate matter.

Now it may be conceded for the moment that considerable advantage might come to the children if, instead of having to find their way into the Church when they became conscious of restoration to God, they were required to separate themselves from it by their own deliberate act, if at the age of fifteen or sixteen it was clear that they had not yielded to the influences of a Christian education and received the Holy Ghost. But, apart from the consideration that this advantage might be fully secured in another way, it requires to be shown that the claim is not inconsistent with the Idea of the Church. Church membership implies participation in the supernatural life of the Church. Is that life transmitted by the ordinary laws of descent? Does faith in Christ come to us by Birth, like our features and our complexion, like the colour of our hair and the

form of our limbs? We may inherit the temperament of our parents and their passions; but do we inherit the inspiration of the Holy Ghost? That the children of eminently good men may be born with moral dispositions which show the ennobling effect of their parents' piety; that they may possess in exceptional strength those natural sentiments which are akin to the supernatural affections, and are often mistaken for them; that they may pass out of "this present evil world" into "the kingdom of heaven," without any sharp and severe moral conflict; that when they have received the Divine life their moral nature may be favourable to the development of the purest and most refined forms of Christian virtue;—it is not necessary to deny; although, apparently, innumerable facts might be alleged on the other side: but, unless we go very much further than this, and contend for the existence of a law under which God grants the supernatural life to the children of all regenerate parents, no adequate reason can be shown why such children should be constituted members of the Church on the ground of their Birth.

It has also been suggested that the traditional practice of Congregational Churches, which requires from a candidate something beyond a bare application to be received into membership, should be abandoned. The customs of our Churches vary. Fifty years ago it was not unusual to require the applicant for membership to appear at the Church meeting, and to declare publicly his loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ; and every member present had the right to propose any question to him relating to his personal religious history. In many Churches, till very recently, every applicant for membership was expected to address a letter to the Church containing a profession of his religious faith—not of his theological creed—and some information concerning the circumstances and influences which led him to decide to live a Christian life. It is still usual for one or two of the members of the Church to visit the candidate before he is received into fellowship; and it is on their testimony and that of the pastor that the Church determines whether he shall be received or rejected. The "visitors" are sometimes deacons, sometimes private members

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

of the Church. When the applicant is a woman, the "visitors" are often women, and their "testimony" is given in a letter, which is read to the Church by the pastor. The "visitors" are sometimes appointed by the pastor on his own authority; sometimes by the pastor and deacons; sometimes by a vote of the Church on the nomination of the pastor. If they are not directly appointed by the Church, they are sometimes appointed before the name of the applicant is "proposed" to the Church; and if they are not satisfied, fresh visitors are appointed, or the application is withdrawn, and the Church hears nothing of it. In some cases there are no "visitors," and the Church acts on the testimony of the pastor. In nearly all cases, the candidate is "proposed" at one Church meeting and his application is voted upon at the next, the month's interval being intended to afford opportunity for information to be sent to the pastor if it should happen that any of the members know that the candidate is an unfit person to be received into membership. Where there are "visitors," it is considered to be their duty to satisfy themselves by personal conversation with the candidate, that he is trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for the pardon of sin and the gift of eternal life, and that he is endeavouring to keep God's commandments; in the case of applicants who are unknown to the Church, the "visitors" are also expected to inquire into their general moral character; parents are asked whether their children who desire to enter the Church are obedient and dutiful; mistresses, whether their servants are truthful, industrious, and honest; masters, whether men in their employment are sober and trustworthy. Where there are no "visitors," the pastor assumes the responsibility of giving to the Church satisfactory assurances on all these points.

These practices look very much more formidable on paper than they are in reality. Nearly always, before there is any application for membership, the relations between the pastor and the applicant are so intimate that a special interview is unnecessary. "Visitors" who have any tact and delicacy, satisfy themselves of the religious earnestness of candidates without any formal examination. Looking back over a ministry of eighteen years, I cannot recall more than two or three cases

in which what is sometimes called the "ordeal" of admission has prevented persons from applying for membership.

It is maintained, however, by some that all these usages should be abandoned, and that the Church should receive all applicants. The whole responsibility, it is argued, should be thrown upon the candidate; no questions should be asked; whoever desires to enter the Church should be free to enter it.

I am not anxious, in this paper, to defend the wisdom and expediency of our traditional customs, much less to maintain that in practice we are never guilty of want of wisdom and generous consideration in our treatment of applicants for membership; but it is of importance to consider the validity of the grounds on which a change is demanded.

It is said that our customs are not sanctioned by the practice of the apostles. It is, of course, absurd to suppose that there was any preliminary inquiry in the case of the three thousand converts who were baptized on the Day of Pentecost, and who constituted the original Church in Jerusalem. Nor is there any reason to suppose that there was any such inquiry in the Churches at Corinth, Ephesus, or Philippi. The Churches received all that came. It was enough that a Jew or a heathen wished to be baptized. But it may be fairly replied, that when the Gospel was preached in the streets of a city whose rulers had a few weeks before put Jesus of Nazareth to death as a blasphemer and an impostor, and when Churches were founded among the pagans of Ephesus and Corinth, men did not enter the Church as a matter of course, or to comply with a decent custom, or to honour a sacred tradition. The Church was kept clear of formalists by a sharper "ordeal" than Congregationalists have ever invented. Some men might be hurried into the Church by an unintelligent enthusiasm; some might be drawn into it by the mystery of its supernatural gifts; some might submit to Baptism and try the worth of the new Religion through weariness of life and a craving for an unknown rest and peace. But it required so severe a moral effort in a Jew to acknowledge a crucified religious teacher as the Messiah, and a heathen man was subjected to such scorn and social isolation if he separated himself from the worship and usages of his fellow-countrymen, and became a member of an obscure sect whose Founder had

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

been rejected by His own people, and whose representatives were universally despised and hated, that the Church had a right to take for granted that every candidate for Baptism had a strong faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Saviour of mankind. To maintain that because the Church was open to all applicants when the profession of Christianity brought with it social suspicion and hostility, and might involve ruin of fortune, and even martyrdom, it ought also to be open to all applicants when the condition of Society has been so changed that to be a Church-member may be rather favourable than prejudicial to a man's inferior interests, is to fall into the very mistake with which the Puritans were charged; it is a superstitious and mechanical following of the practice of the primitive Churches. There was infinite moral significance in the act of a Jew or a heathen in the first century who offered himself for Baptism; no such moral significance can attach to an application for Church-membership in this country in our own times.

It is also alleged against the traditional usage of Congregationalism, that the Church ought not to assume the responsibility of affirming, even by implication, the sincerity of a man's religious faith. Reception into membership after a preliminary inquiry, is said to carry with it a kind of guarantee of the religious earnestness of the accepted candidate, a guarantee which may only confirm and perpetuate self-deception. I imagine, however, that there are very few Congregational ministers who are so negligent of their obvious duty, as not solemnly to remind all who are received into membership that the vote of the Church conveys no infallible assurance that they have really escaped eternal death; nor do I believe that when a man has grave reason to question whether his whole religious history has not been a delusion, his doubts are ever suppressed by the fact that his name is on the roll of a Congregational Church. It is, however, impossible for a Congregational Church to escape from the responsibility of recognizing the personal religious faith of its members. The alleged difficulty and danger do not disappear with the disappearance of the preliminary inquiry. Unless the very theory of "the communion of saints" is to be abandoned, all who are in the

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

Church must be recognized as being also in Christ. They have to discharge duties which imply that they know the will of God, and desire to do it. When they meet at the Lord's Supper, they acknowledge each other as brethren in Christ, whose sins have been forgiven for His sake, and who are assembled to rejoice in their restoration to God through Him. The mere fact that when a man entered the Church, the Church scrupulously avoided whatever might seem to imply an assurance that he was regenerate of the Holy Ghost counts for very little, if, year after year, all his relations to the Church imply that he is living a supernatural life.

Nor should it be forgotten that a man's entrance into the Church involves his reception by the Church. He does not merely act himself, the Church must act also. He cannot be received, unless the Church receives him. If he claims the members of the Church as his Christian brethren, they recognize him as a Christian brother. The heartiness and reality of the recognition must depend on the confidence which the Church places in the integrity of his profession of faith in Christ; and if ever the act of the Church, in receiving applicants for membership, becomes merely formal, the act of applying for membership is very likely to become formal too.

The real ground on which, as it seems to me, the customs of Congregational Churches are open to objection is this:—they appear to imply that as soon as a man has received the life of God, the life will so distinctly reveal itself in new forms of thought and emotion, that there will never be any difficulty in recognizing its presence. This is a very grave mistake. The first movements of the supernatural life are generally very obscure. It must gather strength before it can manifest itself in an unequivocal manner. In innumerable cases the consciousness of regeneration does not immediately follow trust in Christ. We rely upon Him for our redemption from this present evil world, but very often, months and even years pass by before there is any vivid sense of actual redemption. And yet it is certain that although the reality of the new birth may not at once be capable of direct verification either to the regenerate person himself or to others, every man who trusts in Christ receives immediately both the pardon of sin and the gift of eternal life.

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

But the usages of Congregational Churches appear to suggest that faith in Christ and the regeneration which, as we know, is granted as the immediate response to faith, are not adequate qualifications for Church membership,—that there must also be certain developments of the supernatural life, sufficiently determinate and sufficiently obvious to demonstrate their supernatural origin to other Christian people. We wait till the regenerate children of God are able to speak and to walk, before we are willing to receive them into the divine “household.” All that we have a right to ask for, is an assurance of personal trust in Christ; wherever this exists, our own faith should make us certain that, whether or not we can discern the signs of regeneration, the man is really regenerate.

The old customs might, I believe, in most cases be retained with great advantage, if it were always remembered that faith in Christ is neither preceded nor followed by any uniform “experience,” and if it were clearly understood that the “visitors” have not to satisfy themselves that the candidate has a developed spiritual life, but to receive from him the assurance that he is looking to Christ as his Prince and Saviour, and is endeavouring to do the will of God. Whether our traditional usages are retained or abandoned, the most determined resistance should be offered to any movement which imperils the great truth that the Church is a supernatural society composed of persons who, in response to their faith in Christ, are regenerate of the Holy Spirit.

The theory that every man who wishes to enter the Church has a right to demand admission, appears to involve the conclusion that every man who wishes to remain in the Church has a right to remain in it. If the Church is exceeding its just authority in asking for some assurance that a man is a Christian before receiving him into membership, it is difficult to understand on what ground it can claim authority to exclude him from membership when it is discovered that his character is inconsistent with his Christian profession. But the right to “excommunicate” the irreligious, appears to be essential to the very existence of the Church.

. It is very curious that our Lord's Parable of the Tares is

usually appealed to as condemning the practice of Congregationalism in requiring some satisfactory testimony to the reality of a man's religious life before the Church receives him. If the Parable had been intended to teach that the Church should receive all comers, the Parable would surely have assumed a very different form. "The householder" would have been represented as condemning his "servants" for being too scrupulous and anxious about the kind of "seed" which they sowed in his "field," instead of condemning them for wishing to root up the "tares" which were already growing among the "wheat." In resisting the intrusion of unsuitable persons into the Church, we are not gathering the tares out of the wheat-field, but preventing them from being sown; which is surely a very different matter. It might be fairly contended that if we have no right to "gather up the tares," lest we should "root up also the wheat with them," there is the more reason for being very watchful against the tares being sown at all.

But that the parable was intended to forbid the separation of unchristian men from Christian communion cannot be conceded. What did St. Paul mean when, after rebuking the Corinthian Church with great severity for tolerating the crime of incest, he said "Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person"? Is it conceivable that when he had "delivered unto Satan" Hymenæus and Alexander that they might "learn not to blaspheme," he would have permitted any Church to retain them in membership? Whatever may be the precise intention of his precept, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers, for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?" it seems impossible to suppose that he would have censured a Church for excluding unbelievers and unrighteous persons from its fellowship.

Nor has any Church ever surrendered the right, or deliberately repudiated the obligation, to excommunicate flagrantly irreligious men. The discipline of the Church of England is deplorably lax, but its Articles define how excommunicated persons are to be treated. Its Homilies declare that "in the primitive Church—which was most holy and godly, and in the which due discipline with severity was used against the wicked

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

—open offenders were not suffered once to enter into the house of the Lord, nor admitted to common prayer, and the use of the holy Sacraments with other true Christians, until they had done open penance before the whole Church.” Replying to the argument, rested on the Parable of the Tares, against Congregational Discipline, John Robinson asks, in his vigorous and severe way, “If the Parable be thus meant, how can it be defended that any Church should cast out any offenders whomsoever? How dare the prelates in England, with their substitutes, take this forbidden weed-hook into their hands, and use it against any tare amongst them? If any tares be to be plucked up, why not all? and if all be to be left alone, why meddle they with any? Indeed I must needs acknowledge, and will not wrong them, that if they should execute their own Canons, as they have framed them, they should not very oft practise against this exposition, nor gather the tares from among the wheat, but the wheat from among the tares.”* It is only fair, however, to remember that the keen controversialist, in his eagerness to make a “point,” seems to have overlooked the fact that the Canons require that the Lord’s Supper should be refused to those who are guilty of adultery, incest, drunkenness, swearing, ribaldry, usury, malicious and open contention with their neighbours, or openly living in notorious sin.

But the whole argument from this Parable ignores our Lord’s own interpretation of it. “The field” out of which the servants are forbidden to gather the tares, is not “the Church,” but “the World.” It is curious to observe how different classes of theologians trifle with these two great words. When the representatives of a narrow theology read that “God so loved the *World* that He gave His only begotten Son,” they say that this cannot be true, and insist that it means “God so loved the *Church*.” When the representatives of a latitudinarian theology, or at least of a latitudinarian theory of Church discipline, read this Parable, and find that the Tares and the Wheat are to be permitted to grow together in the *World*, they insist that it means that they are to grow together in the

* “A Justification of Separation from the Church of England.” Works, vol. ii., p. 123.

Church. I stand by the plain words, and take it for granted that when the New Testament speaks of the World it means the World, and that when it speaks of the Church it means the Church.

The Parable was intended to correct the very natural expectation of the disciples that the Messiah would gather together, in one great secular State, all who acknowledged His authority, and would commission His servants to destroy all who rejected Him. At His resurrection He was to receive "power over all flesh," but He forbids any war of extermination against those who do not confess His majesty and obey His laws. His kingdom is to be unlike any other kingdom. It is not to be a separate nationality, an organized imperial power, maintaining open war against all who are hostile to it. His true and loyal subjects are to live among those who are disobedient to Him; the wheat and the tares are to grow together; the destruction of the rebellious is not to take place till the end of the world. "The reign of the saints" has been the dream of enthusiasts in many countries and in many ages. They have contended that the World, and not merely the Church, belongs to Christ; in this they were right; but when fanaticism has corrupted and degraded enthusiasm they have gone on to argue that those who are loyal to Christ should crush and destroy all His enemies, should give them no chance of accumulating wealth or gaining political power, should fetter them with political and social disabilities, make their life shameful and intolerable, and even put them to death for obstinate and contumacious unbelief.

There is very much to be said for religious persecution. It is by no means an irrational theory that if those who have received a Divine revelation can obtain political power, they should hang infidels, and burn flagrant heretics, and fine and imprison all who are guilty of holding and propagating minor religious errors. For infidelity, it may be argued, imperils not only the soul of the infidel, but the souls of other men; and it is treason against the true Lord of mankind. Heresy corrupts and ruins the spiritual life of the race. Even the least religious error is pregnant with a brood of unknown evils. But Christ condemns what the rash and unwise zeal even of good men has sometimes attempted. In "the World," the tares and the wheat

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

are to grow together; to infer that they are also to grow together in the Church is a most illegitimate inference; if the inference were admitted, the very Idea of the Church would be destroyed.

There does not appear to be any disposition on the part of Congregationalists to abandon the principle that the Church is bound to excommunicate those whose character disqualifies them for communion; the only reason for introducing this discussion lies in the consideration that, in the circumstances of modern Society, if the Church has no right to assume the responsibility of exercising any discrimination as to who shall be admitted into its fellowship, it appears difficult to resist the conclusion that it has no right to assume the responsibility of determining who shall remain in its fellowship. If to maintain the Idea of the Church it is necessary that unchristian men should be expelled, it seems equally necessary that unchristian men should not be received.

II. *The Idea of the Church in relation to Communion.*

But the Idea of the Church may not be fulfilled even when the Church is constituted only of regenerate members; and it is a grave defect in Modern Congregationalism that, although it continues to insist on the necessity of the supernatural life as the condition of Church-membership, it does not seem to apprehend with any distinctness the chief purpose for which Christian Churches are organized. It is hard to see what advantage comes to a man from entering the Church. With one great exception, what we are accustomed to call "the privileges of Church-membership" often seem practically worthless. Those who are Church members, and those who are not, are present at the same assemblies for worship, listen to the same religious instruction, work the same religious organizations, and contribute alike to nearly all the funds of the Church. When they are in trouble, they receive from the pastor and from their friends the same sympathy. Except once a month, when the Lord's Supper is celebrated, the line which separates those who are in the Church from those who are outside, almost disappears. The exception is of transcendent importance, but its magnitude is most inadequately appreciated by many Congregationalists, and some have suggested that even this, which is almost

the solitary distinction of Church membership, should be no longer maintained, and that while the separate organization of the Church is still perpetuated, the Lord's Table should be open to all who desire to sit there. Apart from this, most Congregationalists would not find it easy to say in what "the privileges of Church-membership" consist. There are many persons who regard the right of voting for the admission of candidates for communion, and for the appointment of a pastor or a deacon, not as a "privilege," but as a responsibility from which they prefer to be free. When no vote of this kind has to be given, "Church meetings" are, I believe, very often, either precisely of the same character as the weekly meetings for prayer, which any person who likes may attend, or else they are meetings for the transaction of formal business, in which no rational man can feel any intense interest.

Those who are familiar with the inner life of Congregational Churches know that there is often wonderful beauty and pathos in the mutual sympathy which is developed among their members; that the rich feel it to be their special privilege and delight to lessen the hardships of their poorer brethren; that the Christian life of the young is sheltered and sustained by the love and wisdom of those who have long known Christ; that the loneliness and monotony of the sick-room are relieved by the unofficial ministries of Christian friendship; that when misfortune and adversity come upon a man, he is often astonished by the strength and depth of the loyal affection which is called forth by his troubles; that there is the purest joy in many hearts over the well-doing of those who are faithful to Christ, and that the sin of one member fills many with the keenest sorrow and distress. But this "communion of saints," even where it exists in its highest perfection, does not seem to be directly promoted by the action of the Church, and it might be almost said by an unfriendly critic that a Congregational Church is often nothing more than an organization for keeping improper persons from the Lord's Supper, and for securing the election of well-qualified ministers and deacons.

These were certainly not the ends for which the Church was originally created. It would be very strange if a Society were instituted merely to preserve the purity of its own member-

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

ship and a regular succession of efficient officers. As the Church sprang into existence to satisfy the strong craving of Christian men for communion with each other, the Idea of the Church is never fulfilled except when this communion is secured. The common prayers and thanksgivings of our ordinary meetings for worship are not enough. It is to be feared that they do not develop the consciousness of a common life where that consciousness does not exist. It is certain that where there is an earnest longing in the hearts of Christian men for intimate communion with each other, our ordinary meetings for worship leave it unsatisfied. "Public worship" is often mere "private worship," offered in a public building and in a public meeting. The sense of spiritual isolation remains, although the gratitude and the penitence of a thousand hearts are being expressed to God in the same prayer.

How this unsatisfactory condition of things is to be remedied, it is not easy to suggest. Our traditions are unfriendly to free and trustful religious intercourse. We are said to be a reticent and reserved people. We repress all manifestations of religious emotion. We are afraid of assuming to be "saints," and are unwilling to let men know that we think much about God and Christ. We are shy in expressing our religious convictions and the conclusions which we have reached as the result of our personal religious history and our reflection on divine truth. No mechanical arrangements for freer and more intimate religious communion will be likely to effect a change. It must come from a nobler conception of the Church, and a truer understanding of the nature and necessities of the supernatural life.

We must work upon the material already in our hands. In every Congregational Church there are men and women who have a deep and vivid sense of the spiritual unity of all who are in Christ. These are the persons who care for the sick and the poor, and to whom even the prosperous turn in their trouble for sympathy. Such persons might be gathered together in an informal way, and encouraged to meet regularly for prayer and for conversation on Christian truth and duty. Others would soon be attracted to these meetings, and the

whole Church might gradually discover the joy and strength which come from free communion in Christian thought and worship. The younger members of the Church might be assembled in classes for the same purpose, instead of being urged to take up various forms of Christian work before they have attained any depth and steadiness of religious life, and any clearness and definiteness of religious knowledge. But the true Idea will not be fulfilled until there are regular meetings of the whole Church for Worship and Conference,—meetings at which whosoever “hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation,” will be free to contribute to the knowledge and to deepen the spiritual earnestness of his brethren. Such meetings would develop and confirm the consciousness of a common life, and would make the “communion of saints” a reality instead of a name. If, at one meeting, a man rose and stated the perplexities which appeared to him to hinder a large and generous trust in the promises of Holy Scripture, that God will answer prayer,—if, the next week, another spoke of the difficulties of maintaining a lofty integrity in business,—they would discover that their perplexities and difficulties had troubled many besides themselves, and they might receive far more assistance in overcoming them from the frank suggestions of some unknown member of the Church than had ever come to them from books, or from the sermons of the minister. Sometimes, the rough but pathetic words of a poor man might remind the wealthy of hardships and sufferings which in their luxurious comfort they are in danger of forgetting; sometimes, the manner in which a rich man spoke of the rest and peace and consolation to be found in Christ, might suggest to the poor that the wealthy have to endure sorrows as keen and bitter as their own. Truths of which the Minister has no vivid apprehension, duties which, through a want of practical knowledge of the common lives of men, he may omit to enforce, would often be illustrated by unofficial members of the Church with clearness and power. The effect of such Conferences would be to create a mutual trust and affection which would be fruitful in a thousand gracious acts of kindness and brotherly care. Isolation would cease, and in all the vicissitudes of common sorrows and common joys, not

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

the Pastor's sympathy alone, but the sympathy of the Church, would be the consolation and the strength of its members.

It may be objected that the social distinctions which separate the members of the Church from each other render free communion of this kind difficult, if not impracticable. The objection is the strongest confirmation of the position for which I am contending,—that the common prayer and common praise of our ordinary services have not developed the consciousness of our intimate union with all who are one with Christ, and of the equality of the sons of God. We stand apart from each other. The sentiments and habits originated by distinctions of social rank are stronger than the instincts and affections of the supernatural life. We are unable to forget the differences between wealth and poverty, the squire's mansion and the labourer's cottage, the master's private room and the clerk's desk, when we ought to remember only that we have committed the same sins, have felt the same penitence, have been redeemed by the same Sacrifice, forgiven by the same Mercy, regenerated by the same supernatural power, and made heirs of the same eternal glory. There was a time when the life of the Church—as distinguished from the life of its individual members—was so intense that in the consciousness of their communion with each other and with Christ, Christian men forgot all the passions and prejudices and bitter memories which had divided them; the fiercest national animosities were subdued by the sense of common citizenship in a Divine Kingdom; masters and slaves not only confessed but felt that they were brethren in Christ. If the life of the Church is not strong enough in our own days to perfect a similar union among its members, and to enable them to rise above the region of "things seen and temporal," to which alone distinctions of social rank belong, into the region of "things unseen and eternal," it is time that we considered how we may recover the diviner spirit of earlier days.

The difficulty of recovering the true ideal of Christian communion arises, perhaps, as much from the unspiritual eagerness of some in an inferior social rank to assert their equality with those above them, as from the unspiritual reluctance of the wealthy to forget their social superiority to those below them. There is an insolent familiarity as well as an insolent pride.

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

Even in the Church a child is not released from the obligation to show to a parent filial respect. Christian brotherhood does not cancel the claim of age and wisdom to respect and deference ; nor does it cancel the claim of those who, in the organization of society, have a higher place than ourselves to consideration and courtesy. There have been faults on both sides; and they will only disappear when there is so vivid a consciousness of the dignity of the supernatural life, that in the Church the rich shall cease to think of asserting their superiority to the poor, and the poor of asserting their equality with the rich. Such a struggle on either side is the sign of a defective recognition of the transcendent greatness of their common relationship to God.

It may further be objected that there are some who shrink from religious contact with men whose tastes are less refined and whose intelligence is less cultivated than their own; that we are bound to recognize the fastidiousness, if so it must be called, which renders a man incapable of associating with people whose natures are coarse and rude, even though he may believe them to be true Christians; and that we ought all to remain free to follow our own sympathies and preferences in the election of those with whom we are to have spiritual communion. The answer is clear. It hardly becomes *us* to recoil from men from whom Christ does not recoil. If the Divine "fastidiousness," God's infinite disgust at sin, has not made God shrink from contact with *us*, we ought to doubt whether we are right in shrinking from communion with any of our Christian brethren who have been less fortunate in their birth and education than ourselves. In the family, we have no choice as to the kind of persons we shall have for our brothers and sisters; we have to take them as they come; and if it were otherwise, the moral discipline of the family would be worthless: we have to love them, and to be gentle to them, live with them under the same roof, and sit with them at the same table, though our temper and our tastes may be very different from theirs, and though we may have very little intellectual sympathy with them. In the Church, analogous obligations rest upon us. The love of the brethren, by which "we know that we have passed from death unto life," is not a love for people

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

who are naturally loveable, and to whom we should be drawn by their natural grace and refinement; it is an affection which fastens on the divine life in a man even when it is almost concealed under a rough temperament, under manners which repel us, and under ignorance and prejudice which, but for the supernatural element in him, would provoke our antipathy and contempt. It makes us eager to share with our brethren whatever advantages may have come to us from the fortunate accidents of our education, or from any felicity of native disposition; if we have had a wider and more generous culture, to loosen their unintelligent prejudices; if we have greater refinement, to soften in them what is rugged and harsh. An Epicurean seclusion from intercourse with the people who most need what we are specially able to give them, cannot be in harmony with the mind of Christ, who "pleased not Himself," and was scorned as the "Friend of publicans and sinners."

We were made to serve each other; and if the Idea of the Church is to be realized, there must be, on the part of Christian men, the frank and cordial acceptance of their mutual obligations, and an equally frank and cordial recognition of the presence of the life of God and the supernatural illumination of the Holy Ghost in all who have received Christ. The restoration of "the communion of saints," instead of repelling people from the Church, as some seem to fear, would constitute an irresistible attraction to it. The tendency to spiritual isolation is abnormal. It is generally the result of circumstances which have repressed, by failing to satisfy, the natural and instinctive longing of men to escape from the narrow and monotonous circle of their personal anxieties and sorrows and joys into a larger and fuller life. Give them the chance of real fellowship with the infinitely varied experience of a community, and the instinct will reveal its power. It would then become worth while to enter the Church; and "the privileges of Church-membership" would cease to be almost nominal.

The Church would become infinitely richer in spiritual thought; it would have a larger and more varied knowledge of the perpetual revelation of God to those who have received the Holy Ghost; its spiritual and moral life would receive a freer and more complete development. Our faith is, that we

are all "taught of God;" that the "spirit of wisdom and revelation" is not granted merely to the official teachers of the Church; that every Christian man is the friend of Christ, and must have something to tell us about Christ which no other man has ever learnt. "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man," not for his own sake alone, but for the profit of the whole Church. It is our personal history which renders us capable of apprehending spiritual truth. The highest form of inspiration cannot enable a man to receive manifestations of God which lie remote from his own spiritual life. St. Paul declares that one end of the troubles which came upon him was, that he might be able to comfort others in their tribulation by the comfort wherewith he himself had been comforted of God. Every Christian man walks in a path along which no feet but his own have ever travelled before, and every different path leads into new regions of beauty, of wonder, of awe, and of glory. The life of a minister may, perhaps, be more favourable than any other kind of life to the accumulation of large and various spiritual knowledge; but it cannot be supposed that the life of a minister is without its disadvantages, much less that it exhausts all the varieties of human experience. There are many things of which he can know nothing except at second-hand. Many of the sharpest troubles of other men are not his troubles, just as many of his perplexities are not theirs. Divine promises which have infinite depths of meaning to many of his congregation, which are consecrated to them by a thousand pathetic remembrances of sorrow and consolation, of conflict and victory, have for him hardly any significance. It is possible that if the Church sometimes listened to the more devout of its members whose circumstances are most unlike the circumstances of the minister, it would discover that there are aspects of truth which are most unlike those with which the minister is familiar. The minister is generally sheltered from the rougher storms which beat upon other men. He knows nothing of the rude conflicts in which some of his congregation have to spend their days. His seclusion from secular affairs often results in a certain softness of character, in a want of fibre and muscle, in an almost feminine delicacy of emotion, and in a feminine type of morality. This must affect his ap-

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

prehension of man's relations to the world and to God, and his ideal of Christian perfection. It is possible that a more masculine element of thought and sentiment might be introduced into the life of the Church if, in free Conference, those members of the Church whose position and history are most different from his, would state frankly what they had learnt concerning the way in which God's will is to be done on earth as it is done in Heaven.

However this may be, it must surely be a grave loss to the Church that all the truth to which it listens passes through one man's brain, and is the growth of one man's thought and life. The Idea of the Church will never be fulfilled till the impulse which moved the first Christians to sell their possessions and goods and part them to all men as every man had need, to call nothing they possessed their own, but to have all things common, finds expression in a higher sphere. The Church exists to promote "the communion of saints," and no stateliness of worship, no ministerial eloquence, earnestness, and wisdom, can compensate for the absence of free, generous, and trustful religious intercourse among its members. Apart from this, that transcendent union of which the organization of the Church is the expression—the union in Christ of men of every variety of temperament, of every degree of intellectual culture, and of the most dissimilar social positions, cannot be vividly present to the Christian consciousness.

III. *The Idea of the Church in relation to the Power of the Church.*

The Idea of the Church, as illustrated by its Origin and by the chief Purpose for which it exists, may assist us to determine the limits of its Power. The Church is not an artificial Society or a voluntary Club. It is the organic realization of the supernatural oneness of those who have been made "partakers of the Divine nature," and of the kinship of the sons of God. The Church is the natural home of those who are born from above. No limitations of membership are valid which exclude any who have received the supernatural life. Such limitations involve a refusal to recognize as our brethren those who are the brethren of Christ. Communion with the Church is

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

necessary, according to the Divine order, for the normal development of Christian perfection; and to exclude from the Church those in whom the Holy Spirit dwells, is to inflict upon them an irreparable loss and injury. The Church has just as little right to deny to a regenerate person the aid and support of Church-fellowship, as to deny to the unregenerate the knowledge of the infinite mercy of God revealed to the world through Christ: to mar and to repress the growth of the Divine life where it already exists, is a crime hardly inferior to that of concealing from men the Gospel by which that life is originally quickened. Refusal of Church membership commonly carries with it denial of access to the Lord's Supper; and, therefore, a Church which is closed against the entrance of any Christian persons, is required to show on what grounds it presumes to exclude the friends and brethren of Christ from His Table.

An elaborate theological creed may have the consent of Christendom through a long succession of centuries; or it may rest on the most unambiguous declarations of Scripture; but if a man may be regenerate of the Holy Ghost, though he is unable to accept, and may even deny, some of its articles, the creed cannot be legitimately imposed as a condition of Church membership. Calvinism may be the true theory of the Divine government; but many Christian people are not Calvinists; and a Church which requires of all who enter it the adoption of a Calvinistic confession, is a Society of Calvinists rather than of Christians. It has lost the true "form" of a Church, and has become a voluntary institution for the maintenance of Calvinistic theology. The Idea of the Church may not have perished, but the Constitution of the Church ceases to express the Idea accurately.

In some parts of England I believe that there are Churches which are closed against all who are not Teetotalers. Teetotalism may, perhaps, be the only effective remedy for the drunkenness which is ruining our national strength and prosperity, but unless it be maintained that no man can be a conscientious Christian without being a Teetotaler, a "Teetotal Church," though it may preserve the Idea of the Church, is in form a voluntary club of Christian people for the propagation of Teetotalism. The Idea of the Church limits and restrains

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

its powers ; it cannot claim the kind of freedom which belongs to a voluntary Society.

On the other hand, the Power of the Church becomes divine wherever the Idea is fulfilled. Modern Congregationalists would shrink from using the language in which their fathers were accustomed to speak of the effect of Church censures. John Goodwin expressed the judgment which was common to the Independents of his age when he said that to excommunicate a man is to "deliver him to Satan," and that to do this is to inflict upon him very real and terrible penalties. He says :

"That word of delivering to Satan imports something positive, distinct from and including more in it than ejection out of the Church. It imports a giving up a person to receive a positive punishment from Satan. . . . It is not to leave the man unto Satan only, but it is to deliver unto Satan, which is an act of authority ; to give him up unto him, as to give a man up to the jailor or tormentor.

"Excommunication imports a positive punishment, for it is a spiritual revenge. The negative throwing out of the Church is but that which is common to all societies : ' But the weapons of our warfare ' (says the apostle) ' are mighty through God, having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience,' (2 Cor. x. 4, 6,) as will be evident if we do but lay all these things together : 1. That Satan is ready to punish the man in his spirit by terrors, and to set on his sins with horrors if he have leave from Christ. 2. This man is by the power of Christ given up, and not left only to him. 3. He is given up to Satan to punish and correct him, 1 Tim. i. 20 : ' Whom I have delivered to Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme,' that is, that they may learn how horrid a thing it is to blaspheme by what Satan inflicts. The word translated to *learn* is in the Greek *παιδευθῶσι*, which is to be disciplined as a child is, to learn by rods ; so that being delivered unto Satan to learn how dreadful it is to blaspheme, implies that Satan is to whip them, that they may learn by a suitable punishment what it is to blaspheme, by Satan's casting hellish terrors into their mind." *

They also spoke of the supreme sentence of the Church as being in the words of Tertullian "*Futuri judicii præjudicium.*" †

* "The Constitution, etc., of the Churches of Christ." Works, vol. xi., pp. 44, 45.

† "An Inquiry into the Original, Nature, etc., of Evangelical Churches." John Owen, Works, vol. xv., p. 267.

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

I am not concerned to justify the boldness and definiteness with which Goodwin and Owen explain what seems to be left by Holy Scripture in dark and awful mystery; and I quote these remarkable passages to remind modern Congregationalists that an element is absent from their theory of the Church which had a great place in the theory of their fathers.

Whatever our opinion may be of the precise form in which the elder Independents asserted the supernatural validity of the acts of the Church, they had a far truer and profounder theory of the Power which belongs to every "congregation of faithful men" than is common among ourselves. The ultimate ground of their theory lies in the vividness with which they apprehended the reality of the union between the Church and Christ. The intimacy of this union has a great place in the New Testament writings. The apostolic doctrine of the Church is inseparable from the apostolic conception of the method and results of Christ's redemptive work. To use St. Paul's favourite metaphor, which he employs in several places and for several purposes, the Church is the "Body of Christ;" individual Christians are "members of Christ." To sin "against the brethren" is to "sin against Christ." When St. Paul was persecuting the Church, Christ said to him "Why persecutest thou Me?" In the Church the life of Christ on earth is extended; the Church is "His Body," and, ideally, the acts and sufferings of the Church are the acts and sufferings of Christ Himself. The voice of the Church is the voice of Christ; its works of mercy are inspired by His compassion for human suffering; its zeal for the rescue of men from eternal perdition is the manifestation of the very love which moved Him to die for the redemption of mankind; and the perfections of saints are the expression of Christ's holiness.

It is true that in the New Testament very wonderful prerogatives are attributed to every regenerate man, but it is difficult to understand how it is possible to resist the impression that the great inheritance of wisdom, strength, and joy which is ours in Christ belongs to the Church rather than to individual Christians.

Nor can the force of those passages, in which the wealth and glory of the ideal Church are described, be broken by the sug-

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

gestion that these are descriptions of the Holy Catholic Church, and not of separate communities of Christians. For, according to the spirit and idiom of apostolic thought, what is affirmed of the universal Church appears to be affirmed of every organized assembly of Christian men. It is not the manner of the apostles to address any particular Church as though it were a fraction of a larger community. The Church at Corinth is not a mere member of that "one Body" into which all Christians are "baptized" by "one Spirit;" it is itself the "Body of Christ." The whole is present in every part.

If more definite authority is necessary for this conception of the ideal completeness of every separate Church, and of the Power which it derives from its union with Christ, the words of our Lord Himself appear to supply all that can be required: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."*

Through some evil accident, these words are constantly quoted with an addition which lowers their meaning, and indeed quite suppresses the specific truth which they were intended to teach. There is indeed a double misconception of the passage common in our Churches. It is sometimes spoken of as a "Promise;" but our Lord did not intend to *promise* that He would be with His disciples when they meet in His name; He declares that, as a matter of fact, "where two or three are gathered together" in His name, He also is present; they cannot meet without having Him with them; whatever this special Presence of His may be, it is not contingent on His fidelity to His promise; He does not say "where two or three are gathered, there *will I be*," but "there *am I* in the midst of them." What, perhaps, is a still clearer indication of how the passage has been misunderstood, is the habit into which many Christian people have fallen, of quoting the passage as though it read "there am I in the midst of them, *and that to bless them*." This was not at all what our Lord meant.

He had just said, "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." He promises that the prayer in which "two or three" unite shall be answered—

* Matt. xviii. 19.

not by Himself, but by the Father. The ground on which this promise rests is that when His disciples are gathered together in His name, He is one of the assembly, however small it may be; the prayer in which they unite is His as well as theirs; in realizing their union with each other, they realize their union with Himself; He is present, not to answer the prayer, but to unite in it.

But this Presence with "two or three" gathered together in His name, is the ground not only of the assurance that united prayer should certainly be answered, but of the declaration which invests with supernatural efficacy the sentence of the Church on the offending brother who refuses to submit to its authority: "If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven."* *Ubi Ecclesia ibi Christus*. Christ is the Head of the Church; where the Church is, there Christ is. The prayers of the Church will be answered, because Christ Himself is in the assembly that offers the prayers: and when the Church excludes an obstinate and impenitent brother, the exclusion has a supernatural validity, because Christ is a party to the act: "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them."

It was not possible that the full meaning of these words should be apprehended at the time when they were spoken. Like many other of the words of Christ, they received their interpretation when the Kingdom of Heaven was actually established, and when the Comforter brought to the remembrance of the apostles all that they had heard from Christ Himself. It is possible, indeed, that even then the mystery remained only partially manifested. There was no necessity that the invisible powers which sustain the action of the Church should be fully revealed. It was enough that men recognized in the Church a supernatural society, and knew that its acts had other effects than follow the acts of a merely

* It would extend this Essay beyond all reasonable limits if I attempted to discuss the relations of these words to similar words spoken to St. Peter.

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

human organization. But though we are ignorant of all that is meant by the confirmation in Heaven of the sentence by which a man is excluded from the Church on earth, the words of Christ make it perfectly certain that excommunication inflicts a terrible penalty on sin.

The excommunicated are no longer recognized as the brethren of Christ; they are solemnly disowned; they are cast out of "the household of faith." Whatever peace of heart, whatever spiritual strength, and whatever sense of nearness to God come from having a home in the Church, are lost. If, as seems to have been the case with the excommunicated person at Corinth, there is spiritual life notwithstanding flagrant sin, those who are excluded from the Church endure all the misery of conscious separation from the region of light, security, and joy in which God dwells. They are thrown back into the evil world from which they had been delivered, and in which, if they still possess the life of God, they can have no rest. They are exiles from their country, and live among strangers and enemies. Their right to consider themselves citizens of the Divine Kingdom becomes doubtful. No special manifestations of God's favour support them in their banishment; but the act of the Church—this seems to be suggested—is confirmed by the withdrawal of the consolations of the Holy Ghost. By their exclusion from the Church they also lose all the supernatural help which had reached them through the ministry of Christian affection and sympathy. One great channel of Divine grace is closed to them. Direct access to God is possible to them still; but the vigorous life and the exulting joy which are derived from the "communion of saints," are theirs no longer. Every excommunicated person becomes to the Church "a heathen man and a publican;" and for the loss of all that comes from living union with "the Body of Christ" there is no compensation. The declaration, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," carries with it the assurance that when the excommunicated are denied a place at the Table of Christ, the denial is the expression of the will of Christ. He refuses to receive them as His guests. He no longer recognizes them as His friends. He ceases to confer on them

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

the special blessings which He bestows on those who receive from His hands the broken Bread and the Cup of reconciliation. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them;" and therefore the act of the Church in excommunicating an offending member is the act of Christ Himself.

But if supernatural penalties follow the supreme sentence inflicted by the Church on those who have grossly sinned, supernatural blessings follow its reception into communion of those who have repented of sin and trusted in Christ for salvation. It is by Christ's own authority that they are brought to His Table, and they may confidently expect that He will give them there, not merely the symbols of His Body and Blood, but all that the symbols represent. They will be enabled by the direct action of the Holy Spirit upon their nature to enter into the larger and fuller life of the Church. New breadth of sympathy and new fervour of brotherly love will be conferred upon them. They will be brought into more spiritual union with saintly souls, and the strength and blessedness which are already in the Church will become theirs. As the indispensable condition of their conscious possession of these new privileges, it may be supposed that their reception into the Church will be accompanied with a stronger and more vivid consciousness of their kinship to the brethren of Christ.

A truer apprehension of the supernatural reality and effect of admission into membership would correct the mistake which it is to be feared that some Congregational Churches commit, in requiring that applicants for membership should manifest a vigorous and developed spiritual life. Normally, a developed spiritual life is the result of communion with the Church, and ought not, therefore, to be made the condition of communion. That "full assurance of faith" of which our fathers were accustomed to speak, is not to be looked for among those who have not yet been recognized by the Church as regenerate, and who have not yet sat at Christ's Table. It is when the prodigal son is once more under the same roof with his brothers and sisters from whom he has been long absent, sharing their life, the years of separation and estrangement quite forgotten, that he realizes most fully how perfectly his

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

Father has forgiven all his follies, and how completely he is restored to all that he had forfeited.

To the question whether the acts of the Church in all cases receive supernatural confirmation, the only possible reply is, that the Power of the Church depends upon its union with Christ—not upon the number of its members, not upon their human culture and natural sagacity. The privileges and powers predicated of the Church in the New Testament, are the inheritance of the ideal Church, just as the privileges and powers predicated of the individual Christian are the inheritance of the ideal Christian. "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things." "Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not." "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." "If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness." These things are ideally true of every one who believes in Christ; the extent to which they are true, in fact, varies with the intimacy of every man's union with Christ. And so, just in the proportion that a Church lives and acts in Christ, does its Power become the very Power of Christ.

The absence of a deep and strong faith in the supernatural validity of the acts of the Church is one of the chief defects of Modern Congregationalism. We are alarmed by any theory which invests what seems a human organization with spiritual authority, and have forgotten that since the Church is a supernatural Society it is necessarily armed with supernatural powers.

Every heresy is but the perversion or exaggeration of some Truth, and it can never be suppressed by mere destructive criticism; the Truth, of which it is the corruption, is the only sufficient refutation. The pretensions of ambitious priesthoods must be met and destroyed by the legitimate authority of the Church. If the Christian Commonalty refuses the Power with which Christ has invested it, the Power will be seized by other hands, and will be used to inflict the worst evils on the spiritual life of mankind. The usurped authority of ecclesiastical rulers rests on the awe and fear which, from the beginning, the Church has inspired in those who have confessed that the Church is the Body of Christ and the Temple

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

of the Holy Ghost. Even among ourselves, there is a vague and mysterious dread of Church censures, for which our timid and unsatisfactory theory of the Power of the Church provides no justification. We must have the courage to maintain that where two or three are gathered together in Christ's name, there He is in the midst of them; and that whatsoever they shall bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever they shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven. If we believed this, the reception into the Church of those who are trusting in Christ would be a festival of divine gladness, and the exclusion of the obstinate and impenitent would be invested with awful solemnity; all the deliberations of the Church would be controlled by a vivid sense of Christ's immediate presence; the excitements of passion by which our Churches are sometimes troubled would be subdued, and schemes of personal ambition would disappear.

IV. *The Idea of the Church in relation to Theological Creeds.*

The tremendous Power which for many centuries has been exercised by the Roman Church rests on two great foundations;—its claim to the exclusive right of administering the Sacraments, which it declares to be necessary to salvation;* and its claim to infallibility. According to its authoritative documents, the maintenance and defence of the Truth is one of the great purposes for which the Church exists. Recent Roman theologians appear to have insisted on this with even more emphasis than their predecessors. It constitutes the chief part of the definition of the Church as given by the distinguished Jesuit theologian Perrone: he says, "*Christi ecclesiæ nomine significamus societatem illam, quam Christus Jesus . . . instituit, ut depositum asservaret cœlestis doctrinæ in terras ab se delatæ, atque organum seu medium simul esset, quo hæc ipsa doctrina conservaretur integra atque propagaretur.*"† This conception of the Church is not destitute of Scriptural sanction. St. Paul, in a well-known passage, which only the supposed

* This claim is, however, greatly enfeebled by its concession of the validity of Baptism even when administered by laymen or heretics.

† *Prælectiones Theologicæ*, vol. iv., p. 3.

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

exigencies of theological controversy could have perverted from its true meaning, speaks of "the Church of the living God" as being "the pillar and ground of the Truth." Are we to infer that there is vested in the Christian Church any authority to promulgate a scientific system of theology, and to impose upon its members any theological definitions? What are the functions of the Church in relation to Doctrinal Truth?

The Church, according to its Idea, consists, as we have seen, of those who have received the supernatural life which is God's highest gift to man. But this life was conferred upon those who first received it, in response to their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ—"a man approved of God . . . by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by Him—who being 'delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God,' was "taken, and by wicked hands" was "crucified and slain: whom God . . . raised up, having loosed the pains of death; because it was not possible that He should be holden of it;" . . . and who, as Peter declared, though He had been crucified by the Jewish nation, had been made by God "both Lord and Christ."

These supernatural facts constituted the Gospel which was preached by the apostles on the Day of Pentecost; and it was to the men who believed this Gospel that the Divine life was given. The development of the Church has corresponded to its origin. The supernatural life has always been associated with this supernatural history. That those who have received Christ have an immediate intuition of God, that they find the whole universe bright with His glory, that they hear His voice and see His face for themselves, that they have the direct teaching of the Holy Ghost, has been the strong faith of the earliest ages of the Church; and the faith is confirmed by the personal consciousness of innumerable saints. But this supernatural illumination has never been separated from faith in the earthly history of Christ—"God manifest in the flesh." Nor is it possible that the Church should surrender the great objective facts, which are perpetuated in their substantial reality—it matters not to the present argument with what degree of accuracy—in the four Gospels. The ultimate root of

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

the existence of the Church is the Incarnation of God. Men have become "partakers of the Divine nature," because God first became Partaker of the nature of man. God's whole method of revelation seems to require that He should be made known to men through an objective history, and not merely by direct spiritual teaching. To the knowledge of God, which is eternal life, both factors seem equally indispensable.

The Church began with the manifestation of God under conditions of human weakness, pain, suffering, and temptation,—and through eighteen centuries has rested upon it with unshaken faith. That wonderful history is continually illustrated by direct communion with the living and glorified Christ. It is continually revealing, under the illumination of the Holy Ghost, fresh and unsuspected abysses of Divine truth. But every new age of the Church adds a new chapter to the imperishable story. St. Paul declared that Christ was "alive"—not merely that He had risen from the dead; and in every succeeding generation the Church has declared "He is living still;" has declared this, not as an article of speculative belief, but as a fact to which it could bear direct and independent testimony. Every devout Christian has been a new Evangelist, with a history to tell of miracles of goodness, of which the miracles of Christ's earthly life were but the symbols and the prophecy. The Church is sometimes described as the Defender and Guardian of the original Records of the Christian Faith; but it is much more than this: regenerate of the Holy Ghost, having its home in Heaven, conscious of present communion with Christ, it declares, on the strength of its own direct knowledge of Him, that Christ is the Prince and Saviour of the human race. It leaves to the freest criticism the Books which profess to preserve the earthly life of Christ; but it affirms, with "the full assurance of faith," that no criticism can destroy the reality of the kingdom of Heaven, or the unique glory of its Founder. *The Church of every age is an independent witness to the power and grace of the living Christ.*

Nor is this all. The relations between the Church and Christ originate and develop a whole system of spiritual affections and activities, in which certain great truths are

necessarily implicated. Where Christ is revealed, He inspires boundless love and perfect trust. Communion with Him is felt to be the highest blessedness, and His approval the sufficient reward and the brightest crown, of suffering for righteousness' sake, and of fidelity to difficult and painful duty. Apart from any theory of its relations to the moral government of God, His Death gives rest and peace to the heart which is oppressed by the sense of guilt; and in times of weakness and temptation, those who know Christ appeal to Him for strength and safety. The Church lives and moves and has its being in Christ. Penitence, faith, fear, joy, worship, make its union with Him more intimate. Its supreme memory is the manifestation of Christ in earthly weakness; its supreme hope is the manifestation of Christ in heavenly glory. As certain great moral truths are implicated in the judgments of conscience and in the instinctive movements of the moral affections, so the great truths of the Christian Faith are implicated in the energies and emotions, the impulses and the habits, of the supernatural life. The moral nature of man is the indestructible guarantee of the fundamental principles of ethics, and *the spiritual life of the Church is the indestructible guarantee of the fundamental principles of the Christian Revelation.*

Further, *those who dwell in the light of God have direct intuitions of spiritual truth*, just as those who have a healthy and developed moral nature have direct intuitions of moral truth.

It may, therefore, be expected that wherever there is life in Christ, the substance of the Christian Faith will be preserved under all varieties of ecclesiastical polity and theological creed. The expectation is confirmed by the history of Christendom. The saints of the East and of the West, Romanists and Protestants, Pelagians and Augustinians, have all received a common revelation, and conflicting systems of theology are imperfect expressions of the same spiritual facts. The Church was agitated for centuries by controversies about the Person of our Lord; but it is not necessary that a man should accept the Creed adopted at Nicæa, or the Creed which bears the name of Athanasius, to worship Christ as God; and there are

IN RELATION TO MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

some Unitarians whose spiritual relations to Christ are wholly inconsistent with their denial of His Divinity. St. Francis was as sure as Luther, that we are saved by God's mercy through Faith. John Wesley was as eager as Calvin to insist on the freedom of Divine Grace. Notwithstanding conflicting theories of the Atonement, the death of the Lord Jesus Christ is recognized by all Christians as having a unique relationship to the remission of sins. What M. Remusat has said of the great Ideas of Philosophy which appear and re-appear in every age, from Plato's to our own, is still more true of the great Ideas and Facts of the Christian Faith; they are handed down from generation to generation, like the diamonds and precious stones which are heirlooms in a great family; they are set and re-set, arranged and re-arranged, according to the varying taste and fashion of every age, shining now on the hilt of a sword, and now in the necklace of a bride; but the stones themselves remain, indestructible and unchanged.*

But the "setting" of these Ideas—their intellectual conception—their scientific expression—is affected by the incompetence of human language to the definition of transcendent spiritual truths, and by the imperfections of prevailing philosophical methods. The true nature and intention of the illumination of the Holy Ghost are misconceived when it is attempted to enforce, as of supernatural authority, the Syllabus of a Pope, or the Creed of a Council, or the Confession of a Synod, or when the consent of many churches and many centuries is regarded as investing with the Divine sanction a theological theory. A man with the clearest vision of the sun and stars may hold a very worthless system of astronomy; and the noblest moral intuitions and the purest moral nature are no secure defence against a false theory of ethics. It is for the Church to bear testimony to great spiritual facts, and the worth of its testimony will be determined by the energy and depth of its spiritual life; but when it descends from the spiritual to the intellectual sphere, its authority ceases.

The question, however, may be raised whether certain forms of theological belief or unbelief are not inconsistent with the presence of the supernatural life, and whether, therefore, the

* Abélard, vol. i., p. 9.

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

Church has not the right to make the renunciation of flagrant heresy a condition of Church membership. The creed of a Buddhist or of a Mahometan is plainly a disqualification for membership of a Christian Church; it must be abandoned before a man can be regarded as a Christian; may not some of the theological opinions which prevail in Christendom be an equally sure sign that a man is not in Christ, and ought not therefore to be in the Church? The question, though affording considerable opportunity for interesting speculative discussion, is of no great practical or historical importance. It cannot be maintained that the creeds which have been imposed by the great Churches on their adherents, and the denial of which has been punished with the severest ecclesiastical penalties, could be rejected only by those who were destitute of the supernatural life. Nor is it common, for those who desire to enter into the communion of a living Church, to hold religious opinions of a kind which demonstrate that they have no spiritual knowledge of Christ. The principle by which the difficulty is to be determined, whenever it arises, is clear—however difficult may be the application of it in certain hypothetical cases: there are certain great spiritual truths, the recognition of which is necessary to the existence and development of the Christian life; and, therefore, the rejection of those truths is inconsistent with membership of the Christian Church. The denial of the evil of sin, or of the duty of repentance, or of the holiness of God, or of the obligation to keep His law, or of the wealth of the Divine mercy, or of the reality of the redemption achieved for mankind by the Lord Jesus Christ, is inconceivable where the supernatural life exists. But the theological definition of any one of these truths involves a vast number of purely philosophical questions, about which there may be grave differences among those whose spiritual intuitions of the truths themselves are equally clear and distinct. It is the spiritual intuition, not the intellectual conception, which determines whether there is spiritual life or not. On this ground, Articles of Religion, Creeds, Confessions of Faith, are, in their very nature, inadmissible as terms of Church Communion.

It would be obviously impossible, within the limits assigned

to this Paper, either to illustrate fully the Idea of the Church, or to discuss the relations of that Idea to all the practical topics suggested by the present condition of life and thought in Congregational Churches. Many questions, hardly less important than those to which I have invited consideration, must be altogether omitted; but I venture to think that the general principles for which I have contended might assist us to arrive at just conclusions in reference to the functions of Church officers, their qualifications and their tenure of office; the connection between the Church and Evangelistic work; and the controversy concerning Religious Establishments.

But it is not sufficient that we should have a true theory of the Church. The theory must be translated into fact. During the next thirty years, the ecclesiastical organizations as well as the theological systems of Christendom will be subjected to a severe and critical test. "The fire will try" their "work of what sort it is." The gravest responsibilities rest on those religious communities which believe that their polity approximates most nearly to the apostolic model, and affords the noblest organ for the expression and development of the true Idea of the Church. It is to be feared that modern Congregationalists do not apprehend with sufficient firmness and vigour their distinctive vocation. During the last half-century our thought and strength have been absorbed in the attempt to evangelize the great towns and the scattered hamlets of our own country, and to establish Missions among the heathen. But the work of Evangelization is not distinctively ours; we only share it with Christians of other Churches. Much less is it the supreme duty of Congregationalists to redeem the Episcopal Church of England from that subjection to the secular power to which it has voluntarily submitted, and to force upon it the Divine gift of freedom, which it vehemently resents and rejects as a grievous injustice and an intolerable humiliation. As citizens, it may be one of our chief political duties to vindicate the principles of religious equality, and, as Christians we may be under most solemn obligations to protest against the injury inflicted on the religious life of the nation by the existing Ecclesiastical Establishment; but if we devote ourselves to redressing the evils of other Churches, and do little

MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

or nothing to promote the perfection of our own, we shall fail to render to our country and to our age the service to which God has appointed us. Nor is it our special and characteristic function to contribute to the reorganization of theological science, or to hold a chief place in the controversy with unbelief.

Our history, our ecclesiastical principles, and the disorders which afflict the great ecclesiastical organizations of Christendom, all indicate that we are called to reveal and to realize the true Idea of the Church. By holding fast to the fundamental principle of our polity, that the Church should consist only of those who have received the supernatural life, by strengthening the faith of our people in the presence of Christ "where two or three are gathered together" in His "name," by the development of freer and more intimate spiritual communion among those who have received the Holy Ghost, by the patient cultivation of all the manly and gentle virtues of the Christian character, and of all its spiritual affections, we must endeavour to fulfil that bright Ideal, for the sake of which our fathers, three hundred years ago, endured scorn and exile, imprisonment and death. To them the vision of a Church had come, which should be, indeed and of a truth, what the Council of Trent described as "the most august and blessed Society of Saints." If that vision has faded from our eyes, modern Congregationalism has become false to its noblest traditions, and has lost the ultimate secret of its power.

THE END.







